

September 29, 1966

freedom. At a time in history when we are in competition with totalitarianism for the minds of men, I think it is more important than ever that we encourage and applaud the establishment of educational institutions which encourage freedom of inquiry, thought, and discovery.

I think the objectives of Mackinac College are well reflected in the following article which appeared in the Bay City Times on September 13, 1966:

(By Margaret Allison)

MACKINAC ISLAND.—Mackinac College sees itself headed toward a unique educational breakthrough suited to the times.

Its island campus is permeated with the spirit of high adventure as administrators and faculty talk about how they believe Mackinac will become a new force in education.

The new school opens Wednesday with 150 charter freshmen and some 20 faculty members.

Dr. Morris Martin, dean of faculty, wants to keep this new liberal arts college relevant. "This is the factor for which today's colleges are looking; but too many are high and dry in the backwaters of history."

"I am enthusiastic about learning, but I want to see knowledge used to redirect today's world. Mackinac College will gear its courses to answering the problems of the world in which we live.

David Blair, English department co-ordinator, believes problems of today's world are compounded because much modern literature presents society as meaningless. "A generation which is hungry for relevance is being given a diet of husks," he contends.

In teaching literature at Mackinac, Blair explains, "books will be evaluated in terms of human values, not just structure and form.

He fully expects a new crop of young writers to emerge at Mackinac, who will point man to triumph, not to defeat."

"What happens in a nation's classrooms will have as great a bearing on the future as what happens in its research laboratories," is the conviction of Martin Dounda, member of the English faculty and former speech-writer for the Air Force Systems Command in Washington, D.C.

"The thing that attracted me to Mackinac," he says, "is its avowed aim to educate students for responsible leadership in a technological age."

Prof. E. Harold Tull, physics and introductory science teacher, believes "Anyone who wants to take responsibility for the world needs some knowledge of science." He has been conducting investigations of the ionosphere by means of radio transmitters sent aloft in sounding rockets from Fort Churchill in northern Canada.

Dr. Franklin S. Chance, until recently in charge of research and production at Pfizer International Pharmaceutical Co., wants "to stress math as a way of thinking, rather than just a technique for problem-solving. This is not unique," he added. "Educators have felt this was the main reason for teaching. But at Mackinac I will try to bring it out from under cover so the students themselves realize its importance and achieve mental discipline."

W. Timothy Gallwey, director of admissions, from San Francisco, said "This is the first college to start from scratch with the idea in mind to teach leadership in perspective to world opportunity."

Gallwey, a 1960 graduate of Harvard University, explained before Mackinac was formed teams visited 125 universities and colleges in 20 states, interviewing countless students, teachers and parents. Confer-

ences also were held to explore the concerns and needs of youth for a type of education most suited to the demands of today's world.

"This combination of visits, interviews and conferences revealed the widespread demand for the kind of education that Mackinac College will provide," he said.

Gallwey said the 150-member charter student body has a wide range of academic ability. "Thirty per cent are in the top 10 per cent of their class and could get into any college in the country; 55 per cent in upper one-half and could get into most colleges; the other 15 per cent have leadership potential although their scores are lower. We'll offer a remedial program for them, and if they need more extra help we'll start a special program."

More than 50 per cent of the students "receive some sort of financial assistance," Gallwey said. "We made it possible for all students accepted to meet college expenses."

OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. FARNUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, during my frequent returns to my district in Michigan, it has become apparent, from discussions with constituents about our involvement in Vietnam, that the basic position of the United States is not clearly understood. I have attended every possible briefing, I have studied every possible source of informed opinion, and I have talked to many persons who have seen first hand the situation in Vietnam—my objective being to understand why we are there, what we are doing, and how do we intend to ultimately find peaceful solution to this conflict. I have brought together what I consider the essentials of our commitment in Vietnam in the form of a careful review of our basic position, our efforts for negotiations, the political situation in light of the recent elections, the history of our economic aid, and an honest hard-facts statement on the military situation there. Yet my emphasis is on our desire for peace, for I believe that, more than anything else, the people of my district and of the country as a whole, earnestly desire world peace consistent with our national honor. I have tried to make this review as up to date as possible, realizing that the history of events in that troubled country has been that of constant change, and that we ourselves have had to look again and again for wise alternatives amidst a sea of changing circumstances.

To summarize our position in the world on the question of peace, and how we propose to bring about a just peace, we have no finer projection of our objectives than that enunciated by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, in the plenary session in general debate, on September 22, 1966. Rather than paraphrase or excerpt, I am asking unanimous consent that Ambassador Goldberg's address be printed in the RECORD following my review of our basic position, as his statement marks a significant initiative for peace which must be

considered as an integral part of our basic U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The United States is ready to order a cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam, when assured—privately or otherwise—that this step will be answered promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation of aggression against the South.

The United States is also ready to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs so that peace can be restored in South Vietnam, and favors international machinery to insure effective supervision of the withdrawal.

In stating these U.S. proposals to the United Nations General Assembly, American Ambassador Arthur Goldberg made clear September 22 that the United States desires a political, not a military, solution to the conflict in Vietnam. And he stressed that Vietcong representation in unconditional discussions or negotiations of a political solution would be no insurmountable problem.

In his address Ambassador Goldberg posed these questions:

First. Would the government in Hanoi, in the interest of peace, and in response to a prior cessation by the United States of the bombing in North Vietnam, take corresponding and timely steps to reduce or bring to an end its military activities against South Vietnam?

Second. Would North Vietnam be willing to agree to a time schedule for supervised, phased withdrawal from South Vietnam of all external forces—those of North Vietnam as well as those of the United States and other countries aiding South Vietnam?

All who are devoted to peace will welcome the U.S. initiatives which Mr. Goldberg outlined. As I speak to you today, we are waiting. We are waiting for a positive response from North Vietnam.

As a result of my exhaustive and endless search for the course of reason in this most important national question, I can only conclude that we must support the patience and perseverance of our President.

THE BASIC UNITED STATES POSITION A commitment against aggression

The people of the United States are assisting the people of South Viet-Nam for the same reason that we assisted the people of Greece and of South Korea—to support a free people in the face of Communist aggression. Our goal is to preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to determine their future as they see fit. Tens of thousands of armed, trained men including tons of armaments and North Vietnamese regular army units have been infiltrated into South Viet-Nam to impress Hanoi's will by force.

Three American presidents—Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson—have pledged us to assist South Viet Nam. Many nations whose future may hinge on American support are anxiously watching our actions in South-Vietnam to determine the value of solemn American commitments. Their future conduct, as well as that of hostile nations, will be influenced by the conclusions that are drawn from our support of South Viet-Nam. They are watching to see if America will persevere. Our example will sustain their desire for freedom, independence, and peace.

Countering "wars of national liberation"

To the Chinese Communists, South Viet-Nam is the model of so-called wars of national liberation. If South Viet-Nam is conquered, we can expect future conflicts in Asian nations—Thailand has already been designated as the next target—in Africa and in Latin America. If South Viet-Nam successfully resists, it will show the Communist powers that cheap victories are no longer possible and that the price of aggression is too costly. In time, the Communist powers will hopefully choose to focus their energies on their own vast internal problems.

The goal of self-determination

Our goals in South Viet-Nam are neither military bases, economic domination, nor political alliances. We support the right of the people of South Viet-Nam to elect their government freely and to decide for themselves without outside force and coercion such questions as reunification and neutrality. The United States does not seek the destruction of North Viet-Nam or its regime.

President Johnson stated the American preference for using our resources for the economic reconstruction of Southeast Asia. We are prepared to contribute our share to help these people help themselves. But despite our desire for peace we are determined to honor our commitments and to take all necessary measures until we and the 34 other nations aiding in the struggle successfully assist the people of South Viet-Nam in preserving their right to determine their own destiny. We must not forget that despite our assistance it is the South Vietnamese people who are still suffering the bulk of the casualties in what remains their struggle for self-determination.

Show me the timetable for the withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces and I will show you the timetable for American withdrawal, the President said on Labor Day.

Unconditional discussions

The President's actions and statements over the past year have clearly shown that we are fully prepared to transfer the struggle for South Viet-Nam's freedom from the battlefield to the conference table. We continue to be ready to discuss a peaceful solution without preconditions. When, either as a result of the gradual lessening of hostilities or of a formal settlement, the people of South Viet-Nam are relieved from outside coercion, our forces will be withdrawn.

U.S. EFFORTS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Here are some examples of the continuing search for a peaceful settlement by the U.S. Government during 1965 and 1966:

In February, April, June, July, and December, 1965, the Administration warmly endorsed the repeated efforts by the United Kingdom to find such a solution through its individual efforts and through the collective efforts of the Commonwealth.

In April, 1965, the Administration welcomed the appeal by seventeen non-aligned nations for a settlement through negotiations without preconditions.

In May, 1965, the Administration suspended our bombing of North Viet-Nam and sought some indication of a North Vietnamese willingness to respond.

In June, 1965, the Administration encouraged the attempt by the Canadian representative on the International Control Commission for Viet-Nam to discuss the possibilities of peace with representatives of the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi.

In July, 1965, the Administration sent a message to the Security Council expressing the hope that UN members would use their influence to bring all governments to the negotiating table to halt aggression and evolve a peaceful solution.

From December 24, 1965 to January 30, 1966, a period of 37 days, the President halted our bombing of military and communica-

tions targets in North Viet-Nam. He pursued this course as part of a continuing effort to uncover any signs of North Vietnamese willingness to respond in some constructive way which might signify an interest in a peaceful solution. The purpose and sincerity of our action was conveyed on behalf of the President across the globe by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Governor Averell Harriman, former Under Secretary Thomas Mann, Governor G. Mennen Williams and Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. In addition, U.S. Ambassadors abroad brought the intent of our actions directly to the attention of the leaders of over 100 countries. Our message was conveyed both directly and indirectly to Hanoi.

In June, 1966, the Administration followed closely the peace-seeking mission of Canadian Ambassador Chester Ronning to Hanoi.

The Administration welcomes Prime Minister Gandhi's proposal of July 7, 1966 for a peace conference on Viet-Nam.

In August, 1966, we expressed our great interest in the constructive suggestion of the Government of Thailand for the convening of an Asian Conference to deal with the problem of achieving peace in Viet-Nam.

The Administration encouraged initiatives from world leaders such as President Radhakrishnan of India, former President Nkrumah of Ghana, President Tito of Yugoslavia, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, Foreign Minister Fanfani of Italy, and the Pope, among others, in seeking means of working toward a peaceful settlement.

No meaningful response

What has been the response from Hanoi? There has been no favorable response from Hanoi to any United States or other peace initiative. The North Vietnamese continue to insist that their agents, the Viet Cong, be accepted in advance of any discussions as "the sole genuine representative" of the South Vietnamese people. In other words, North Viet-Nam still insists that it be allowed to control the South before it will even discuss peace.

*THE POLITICAL SITUATION**General situation*

The present Government of South Viet-Nam, composed of a Directorate as the ruling authority over a combined military-civilian cabinet, has served more than one year without major alteration. However, the Government was subjected to internal pressures following the dismissal of one of the Directorate members, General Thi, in mid-March, 1966. On June 6, as a result of these pressures, the Directorate of ten generals was enlarged to include ten civilians. The Government also announced on June 1 its intentions to establish an armed forces-civilian council to serve in an advisory capacity to the Government. This council met for the first time on July 5.

Development of political institutions

On April 12, 1966 the Government convened a National Political Congress, members of which were broadly representative of all non-communist civilian political and religious groupings, to discuss steps to be taken for a return to constitutional government. Prior to the Congress, the Government had announced on January 15 its intentions to establish a National Advisory Council to draft a constitution which would have been submitted to a national referendum in October and followed by elections in late 1967. However, acceptance of the consensus of the Congress, Chief of State General Thieu issued a decree April 14 providing for elections for a constituent assembly within three to five months.

After additional consultations with representative groups, the Government on May 5 convoked a 32-man Election Law Drafting Committee, consisting again of Representatives of Viet-Nam's major non-commu-

nist groups, to draw up draft laws pertaining to the conduct of constituent assembly elections, the composition and functions of the constituent assembly, and the rejuvenation of political activity. In early June the Committee forwarded its recommended draft laws to the Government.

*Constituent assembly elections**Procedures*

On June 19, 1966, the Government of Viet-Nam issued two decree laws pertaining to the organization and functions of a Constituent Assembly and on election procedures for the creation of such an Assembly. The decree laws were the translation into law of a consensus arrived at by the Vietnamese Government and the Election Law Drafting Committee.

They provided for a Constituent Assembly to be convened with the sole purpose of drawing up a constitution. The Vietnamese Election Law allowed for one seat in the Constituent Assembly for each 50,000 voters who were registered for the May, 1965 provincial and municipal elections. Using this formula, there were 108 seats open for elections, including four seats which were reserved for the ethnic Cambodian minority. Nine additional seats were reserved for the Montagnard (hill tribe) minority.

Election would be by the direct method and by a system of proportional representation. In constituencies where there was one seat up for election, individual candidates would run, and the candidate with the most votes would win. In constituencies where more than one seat was at stake, lists of candidates would be submitted for election. A certain percentage of votes would have to be won in order for a list to win a seat for one, or more, of its members. Special provisions were applied to the elections for the Montagnard seats.

Voters in the elections had to be 18 years old as of December 31, 1965, be inscribed on an electoral list, have a valid voter registration card, and have not been deprived of his rights as a citizen. There were no political restrictions placed on voter eligibility. There were approximately 5,600 polling places or one polling place for about every 1,000 registered voters.

Candidates for elections could be male or female, had to be at least 25 years of age, and have held Vietnamese citizenship for at least five years. Some 540 candidates competed for the 108 directly elected assembly seats. Persons who directly or indirectly worked for the Communists, and pro-Communist neutralists as well as neutralists whose actions were advantageous to the Communists were disqualified as candidates.

Within fifteen days after the election, the elected deputies convened the first meeting of the National Constituent Assembly. Under the Constituent Assembly Law the Assembly is allotted six months to draft a constitution. The draft constitution is then to be passed to the Chief of State for consideration by the Directorate and promulgation or return to the Constituent Assembly in revised form. The latter may override the Directorate's revisions by a two-thirds majority vote of all members.

Results

On September 11, 1966 approximately 4,200,000 voters, or 80 percent of the country's 5,288,000 registered voters, went to the polls and elected the Constituent Assembly. They braved a determined effort by the Viet Cong to prevent their voting, which by terror, assassination, threats and violence directed against candidates and ordinary citizens resulted in more than 500 casualties in the period immediately preceding the election.

The Viet Cong did prevent those under their control from reaching the polls, but 80 percent of those eligible in the total population were registered, and, as noted, 80 per-

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23535

cent of these actually voted. By comparison, the average voter turnout in an American presidential election approximates 55 percent of eligible voters; in non-presidential elections, the average is closer to 39 percent.

This was a vitally important step in Viet-Nam's evolution toward representative and constitutional government, to be followed in 1967 by the election of a president and national assembly. Successful candidates include some of Viet-Nam's most prominent nationalists and political figures as well as a representative cross-section of religious, regional, ethnic minority and political faction leaders. Impartial observers confirmed that the election was free of irregularities, and that no public support for the Viet Cong was apparent.

U.S. ECONOMIC AID

Since its formation in 1954 the Republic of Viet-Nam has received substantial United States economic assistance including Food for Peace. During fiscal 1966, the economic aid imports totaled about \$505 million and U.S. assistance for economic and social programs about \$160 million. AID plans to continue at about this same level in FY 1967.

This economic assistance has made it possible to greatly expand programs that meet new and enlarged needs for refugee relief, health education and hospital construction. For example, more than one million South Vietnamese refugees have fled to government-controlled territory since January 1965, and about half have been resettled while the others are in temporary shelters. The United States has provided food, construction materials, blankets and other supplies in refugee relief. Major efforts are underway and expanding in the field of health. We are assisting the Vietnamese to enlarge teaching facilities in medical and dental education. A surgical or medical team is planned for each of the provinces by the end of FY 1967. An accelerated program of hospital renovation, begun in FY 1965, will continue.

Revolutionary development programs

Economic and social welfare programs supported by the United States play a crucial role in the over-all effort to improve the welfare of the rural population and develop their loyalty to the Government of Viet-Nam. As was clearly stated in the Honolulu Declaration, these programs must be closely tied to military and police actions to protect the villagers and political programs to develop local governmental institutions. They cover a broad range from the training of administrators, teachers, doctors, agriculturalists and other technical personnel to the provision of classrooms and textbooks, wells, medicines, seeds and fertilizers. A number of activities are aimed specifically at increasing the participation of rural Vietnamese in local development projects which will give added incentives to village self-defense. These self-help projects include road building, well-digging and school construction, and combine local labor and materials with AID-financed imports of construction commodities. These are the kinds of programs which I strongly support because they help people help themselves.

To foster the revolutionary development program, members of the U.S. AID Mission are working with Vietnamese in every one of the country's 43 provinces. American advisors are also assisting the Vietnamese in measures to deny economic resources to the Viet Cong, the "Open Arms" defector program, and the vital task of training cadres to carry out the entire rural construction program.

Since the success of the entire revolutionary development effort also depends upon the ability of the government to supply and transport personnel and materials to the areas concerned, the U.S. is vigorously supporting programs to improve transport and logistics, electrification, telecommunications,

water and urban development. This serves both to identify the government with the people and to build the structure necessary for long-term development under peaceful conditions.

The problem of inflation

To cope with the inflationary threat, the U.S. and the Government of Viet-Nam have expanded financing of commercial imports and are developing other financial and fiscal measures; this process has been assisted by the work of an IMF mission which visited Viet-Nam in April and May 1966. On June 18 the Government of Viet-Nam announced a major program to achieve economic stabilization. At the same time wage and salary increases for civil and military employees were granted as partial compensation for the erosion of purchasing power which had already occurred and which was anticipated after devaluation. After an initial post-devaluation rise in prices, recent indicators show an encouraging leveling off. Vietnamese and American officials are consulting on additional anti-inflationary measures, including the improvement of port facilities to increase the flow of goods into Viet-Nam.

Free world shipping to North Vietnam

The U.S. Government has been making a serious effort during the past year to eliminate Free World shipping to North Viet-Nam. This effort is underway through a series of high level diplomatic approaches to all the nations involved. In these approaches I point out the recent amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act which would end aid to countries whose ships remain in the North Viet-Nam trade.

As a result we have met with considerable success. During the first seven months of 1966 the average number of calls dropped to 5 a month from 21 a month in 1965 and 34 per month in 1964. In July 1966 only one Free World ship called in North Viet-Nam.

Nearly all of the remaining shipping involves small, coastal vessels under charter to Communist countries, most of which are registered in Hong Kong. Their cargoes are nonstrategic. We know of no shipments of arms on Free World vessels. Nevertheless, U.S. efforts to achieve a complete cessation of this trade will continue.

THE MILITARY SITUATION

Chronological review

In late 1961, in response to an appeal by President Diem and following a high-level U.S. study mission which confirmed the serious effects of the Hanoi-directed campaign of terror and subversion, President Kennedy agreed to increase significantly the U.S. advisory and logistic effort in South Viet-Nam. The Hanoi regime had begun in 1959 to infiltrate into South Viet-Nam former Viet Minh cadres who had regrouped in the North after the 1954 Geneva Agreements and who had received special training in subversion and sabotage.

By the end of 1962 there was evidence that the South Vietnamese had made some military progress against the Viet Cong. The Viet Cong, however, achieved a strength increase and a noticeable increase in use of mortars and recoilless rifles.

By the end of 1963 the Viet Cong appeared optimistic. They improved their military and political situation throughout the country from the Ap Bac battle in January 1963 to increased terrorism following the overthrow of the Diem regime.

Into 1964, the Viet Cong objectives appeared to be to destroy or prevent the establishment of New Life Hamlets, to consolidate "liberated" areas, to destroy South Viet-Nam forces and to counter efforts to obtain Hoa Hao and Cao Dai support. The Viet Cong carried out large-scale operations with relative impunity and achieved some success in their terrorism and propaganda efforts. The continuing infiltration of former Southern

guerrillas was augmented by the infiltration of native Northerners and, late in the year, of regular troop units of the North Vietnamese Army.

During the first half of 1965 the Viet Cong continued to maintain initiative and momentum. South Vietnamese lines of communication were completely disrupted and the Central Highlands isolated for extended periods. In response to the request of Prime Minister Quat, U.S. ground combat units were sent to Viet-Nam, beginning in March, to augment the Republic of Viet-Nam's Armed Forces and thus correct the military imbalance created by the previous introduction of North Vietnamese Army units.

They were later joined by units from Korea, Australia, the Philippines, and New Zealand. Combined South Vietnamese, United States and Free World forces blunted this "monsoon offensive." The number of Communist successes declined and there were some important victories over the Viet Cong. The tempo of Viet Cong activity declined in July but, in October the number of Viet Cong incidents began to increase rapidly through the remainder of the year. In October there were over 3,300 incidents, in November it surpassed 3,600, and in December it reached over 4,000. Each of these was the highest encountered to date in the war. Despite over 40,000 killed or captured and over 9,000 defections, the Viet Cong continued to maintain an offensive capability. Their year-end order of battle more than doubled that at the beginning of 1965.

Combined Viet Cong and North Vietnamese military activity continues in 1966 to follow the familiar pattern of terrorism, harassment, sabotage and small-scale attacks with occasional large-scale operations against isolated Government positions. Recent South Vietnamese, United States and Free World forces operations and air strikes in critical areas are believed to have generally discouraged large-scale enemy activity and disrupted their plans. The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army will probably continue their pattern of terrorism, harassment and sabotage and possibly increase the number of small "hit-and-run" attacks. Whenever they can achieve terms of their own choosing and when and where it suits their purpose, as against the Ashau Special Forces Camp in March, they are likely to attack in force.

Enemy tactics

Enemy tactics have not changed since the war began, despite the intensity of their attacks and an increase in terrorism, propaganda and sabotage. Their operations are still essentially "hit-and-run," emphasizing ambushing and destroying friendly reaction forces.

Order of battle—Current strengths

Government of South Viet-Nam: Despite combat and other losses, the South Vietnamese Armed Forces achieved a modest increase. Their present strengths are: Approximately 316,000; 280,000 Regional and Popular Forces.

United States: Approximately 300,000.

Third National Forces (major contributions):

Korea, 24,500 (soon to be increased to approximately 43,000).

Australia, 4,700.

New Zealand, Philippines and Thailand (see Section on Free World Assistance to South Viet-Nam).

Viet Cong: Approximately 64,000 Main Force, 120,000 irregulars or guerrillas, 40,000 political cadre, 19,000 support.

North Vietnamese Army: Approximately 47,000. There are now 19 North Vietnamese Army regiments in South Viet-Nam opposed to 9 in 1965.

Infiltration

Men and supplies continue to enter South Viet-Nam over established infiltration routes. Current estimates give the Communists the

23536

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 29, 1966

capability of infiltrating approximately five thousand men per month with enough supplies to sustain them until the Viet Cong system can provide for them or until integrated into Viet Cong units. For 1958 to 1964 over 40,000 were infiltrated from North to South Viet-Nam. During 1965, the estimate exceeded 26,000. It is estimated that the 1966 infiltration exceeded 35,000 by the end of July.

Casualties

Combat deaths since 1961, as of August 20, 1966, (with U.S. military deaths until 1965 sustained by advisors only) were: Enemy troops, over 141,000; GVN Military, over 39,000; US Military, 4,832.

B-52 operations

Since they started in June 1965, over 350 B-52 strikes have been conducted against enemy bases in South Viet-Nam. These strikes have provided continual disruption and harassment in hitherto impregnable areas. Prisoners-of-war report that the B-52 operations have been a significant factor in lowering Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army morale.

Air strikes against North Vietnam

Bombing of the North began in February 1965, with a strike on the Dong Hoi Barracks and gradually expanded to military targets along the infiltration route. A pause in the bombing occurred during the period May 13-17, and a second pause of 37 days, began December 24. Our air strikes have these objectives: to make it as difficult and as costly as possible for North Viet-Nam to continue effective direction and support of the Viet Cong; to convince the North Vietnamese Government that its control, direction and support of the Communist insurgency in South Viet-Nam is not worthwhile; to bolster morale in South Viet-Nam.

Our recent bombings of oil facilities in North Viet-Nam, are in line with this general policy.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM

In the foreseeable future, the main burden of outside support for the Government of South Viet-Nam has been and will continue to be borne by the United States. But substantial contributions of military and civilian assistance are provided by a large number of other countries.

At the present time, thirty-four free world countries are providing—and several more have agreed to provide—assistance to South Viet-Nam. Negotiations are underway between the Government of Viet-Nam and many of these nations for additional aid.

The countries now contributing help to South Viet-Nam are:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

Japan, Korea, Laos, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Significant contributions of armed forces have been made in the past year. A Korean combat division has been in Viet-Nam since October, 1965 and a second division is now being deployed. The Australian Government has increased its military forces in Viet-Nam from 3,900 men to 4,500, and New Zealand has raised its artillery battery from four to six howitzers. The Philippine Congress has approved President Marcos' request for a 2,000-man engineering force with supporting security personnel to be sent to Viet-Nam; the advance party of this contingent recently arrived in Viet-Nam.

The Thai Government has announced that it will furnish a landing ship, patrol vessel and two transport aircraft with crews, thereby adding to a previous small military contribution.

Free world personnel, other than American, in Viet-Nam under governmental arrangements now number over 30,000, the large majority of which are military personnel. However, some of these military personnel are engaged in civic action programs, such as revolutionary development and medical care. Among these are personnel from Korea, the Philippines, New Zealand and Australia.

Significant economic contributions have been made by the United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, France, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand in the form of loans, grants, and commercial credits. For example, Germany has made available in loans and grants about \$27 million. Australia has provided technical and economic assistance totalling nearly \$3 million. Assistance since 1955 from France has totalled more than \$111 million, while Japan has provided about \$55 million chiefly in the form of reparations.

Many nations are giving social and humanitarian assistance to South Viet-Nam. More than ten nations are sending medical teams which provide for the medical needs of entire provinces. Others have contributed medicines and supplies for the half million refugees in South Viet-Nam. Educators and engineers from friendly nations are assisting Viet-Nam to rebuild.

U.S. INITIATIVES FOR PEACE—THE FOURTEEN POINTS

The following statements are on the public record about elements which the U.S. believes can go into peace in Southeast Asia:

1. The Geneva Agreement of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia;

2. We would welcome a conference on Southeast Asia or on any part thereof;

3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it;

4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it;

5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;

6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;

7. We want no U.S. bases in Southeast Asia;

8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Viet-Nam after peace is assured;

9. We support free elections in South Viet-Nam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;

10. The question of reunification of Viet-Nam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision;

11. The countries of Southeast Asia can be non-aligned or neutral if that be their option;

12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of Southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Viet-Nam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute a substantial share.

13. The President has said "The Viet Cong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem."

14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Viet-Nam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

HANOI'S REJECTION OF PEACE—THE FOUR POINTS

We are not aware of any initiative which has been taken by Hanoi during the past five years to seek peace in Southeast Asia. In fact, Hanoi has denied that it has ever made any "peace feelers." During 1965 Hanoi has consistently insisted that its four points

must be accepted as the sole basis for peace in Viet-Nam.

Hanoi's four points are:

1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Vietnamese people—peace, independence, sovereignty, unity, and territorial integrity. According to the Geneva agreements, the U.S. Government must withdraw from South Viet-Nam U.S. troops, military personnel, and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all U.S. military bases there, and cancel its "military alliance" with South Viet-Nam. It must end its policy of intervention and aggression in South Viet-Nam. According to the Geneva agreements, the U.S. Government must stop its acts of war against North Viet-Nam, completely cease all encroachments on the territory and sovereignty of the DRV.

2. Pending the peaceful reunification of Viet-Nam, while Viet-Nam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Viet-Nam must be strictly respected—the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, or military personnel in their respective territory.

3. The internal affairs of South Viet-Nam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front without foreign interference.

(This point as interpreted by Hanoi would require that the Viet Cong be accepted as "the sole genuine representative" of the people of South Viet-Nam, whether the South Vietnamese want it or not.)

4. The peaceful reunification of Viet-Nam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN THE PLenary SESSION IN GENERAL DEBATE, SEPTEMBER 22, 1966

As the General Assembly convenes in this twenty-first year of the United Nations, we of the United States are aware, as indeed every delegation must be, of the great responsibilities which all of us share who work in this world organization for peace.

No one, I am sure, feels these responsibilities more keenly than our Secretary General, U Thant. In the past five years he has filled with distinction and effectiveness what is perhaps the most difficult office in the world. We know how much selfless dedication and energy have been exacted from him on behalf of the world community. We can well understand how the burdens of his office led him to his decision not to offer himself for a second term as Secretary General.

The United Nations needs him. It needs him as a person. It needs him as a Secretary General who conceives his office in the full spirit of the Charter as an important organ of the United Nations, endowed with the authority to act with initiative and effectiveness. The members, in all their diversity and even discord, are united in their confidence in him. His departure at this crucial time in world affairs, and in the life of the United Nations, would be a serious loss both to the Organization itself and to the cause of peace among nations. We reiterate our earnest hope that he will heed the unanimous wishes of the membership and permit his tenure of office to be extended. His affirmative decision on this question would give us all new courage to deal with the many great problems on our agenda.

The peoples of the world, Mr. President, expect the United Nations to resolve these problems. With all their troubles and aspirations they put great faith in this Organization. They look to us not for pious words but for solid results—agreements reached, wars ended or prevented, treaties written,

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23537

cooperative programs launched—results that will bring humanity a few steps—but giant steps—closer to the purposes of the Charter which are our common commitment.

Realizing this, the United States has considered what it could say in this general debate which would improve the prospects for such fruitful results in the present session. We concluded that, rather than attempt to review the many questions to which we attach importance, we could make a more useful contribution by concentrating on the serious dangers to peace now existing in Asia—particularly the war in Vietnam; and by treating this subject in a constructive and positive way.

The conflict in Viet-Nam is first of all an Asian issue, whose tragedy and suffering fall most heavily on the peoples directly involved. But its repercussions are world-wide. It diverts much of the energies of many nations, my own included, from urgent and constructive endeavors. It is, as the Secretary General said in his statement on September 1, "a source of grave concern and is bound to be a source of even greater anxiety, not only to the parties directly involved and to the major powers but also to other members of the Organization." My Government remains determined to exercise every restraint to limit the war and to exert every effort to bring the conflict to the earliest possible end.

The essential facts of the Viet-Nam conflict can be stated briefly—Viet-Nam today remains divided along the demarcation line agreed upon in Geneva in 1954. To the north and south of that line are North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam. Provisional though they may be, pending a decision on the peaceful reunification of Viet-Nam by the process of self-determination, they are nonetheless political realities in the international community.

The Geneva Accord which established the demarcation line is so thorough in its prohibition of the use of force that it forbids military interference of any sort by one side in the affairs of the other; it even forbids civilians to cross the demilitarized zone. In 1962 military infiltration through Laos was also forbidden. Yet, despite these provisions, South Viet-Nam is under an attack, already several years old, by forces directed and supplied from the north, and reinforced by regular units—currently some 17 identified regiments—of the North Vietnamese Army. The manifest purpose of this attack is to force upon the people of South Viet-Nam a system which they have not chosen by any peaceful process.

Let it be noted that this action by North Viet Nam contravenes not only the United Nations Charter, but also the terms of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), adopted unanimously only last December and entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty." That resolution declares, among other things, that "no State has the right to intervene, directly, or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State." It further declares that "no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed toward the violent overthrow of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State." It would be hard to write a more concise description of what North Viet-Nam is doing, and has been doing for years, in South Viet-Nam.

Certainly the prohibition of the use of force and subversion—both by this resolution and by the Charter itself—must apply with full vigor to international demarcation lines that have been established by solemn international agreements. This is true not only in Viet-Nam but in all the divided States, where the recourse to force between

the divided parts can have far-reaching consequences. Furthermore, solemn international agreements, specifically the Geneva Accords, explicitly prohibit recourse to force as a means of reunifying that country.

Mr. President, it is because of the attempt to upset by violence the situation in Viet-Nam, and its far-reaching implications elsewhere, that the United States and other countries have responded to appeals from South Viet-Nam for military assistance.

Our aims in giving this assistance are strictly limited. We are not engaged in a "holy war" against communism. We do not seek to establish an American empire or a "sphere of influence" in Asia. We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances, no permanent American "presence" of any kind in South Viet-Nam. We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Viet-Nam. We do not seek the overthrow of the Government of North Viet-Nam. We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China nor to threaten any of its legitimate interests. We do not ask of North Viet-Nam an unconditional surrender or indeed the surrender of anything that belongs to it; nor do we seek to exclude any segment of the South Vietnamese people from peaceful participation in their country's future.

Let me say affirmatively and succinctly what our aims are.

We want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict. By the same token, we reject the idea that North Viet-Nam has a right to impose a military solution.

We seek to assure for the people of South Viet-Nam the same right of self-determination—to decide their own political destiny, free of force—that the United Nations Charter affirms for all.

And we believe that reunification of Viet-Nam should be decided upon through a free choice by the peoples of both the North and South without outside interference, the results of which choice we are fully prepared to support.

These, then, are our affirmative aims. We are well aware of the stated position of Hanoi on these issues. But no differences can be resolved without contact, discussions or negotiations. For our part, we have long been and remain today ready to negotiate without any prior conditions. We are prepared to discuss Hanoi's four points together with any points which other parties may wish to raise. We are ready to negotiate a settlement based on a strict observance of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Agreements, which observance was called for in the communique of the recent meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries in Bucharest. And we will support a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, or an Asian conference, or any other generally acceptable forum.

At the same time we have also considered whether the lack of agreement on peace aims has been the sole barrier to the beginning of negotiations. We are aware that some perceive other obstacles, and I wish to make three proposals with respect to them:

First, it is said that one obstacle is the United States bombing of North Viet-Nam. Let it be recalled that there was no bombing of North Viet-Nam for five years during which there was steadily increasing infiltration from North Viet-Nam; during which there were no United States combat forces in Viet-Nam; and during which strenuous efforts were being made to achieve a peaceful settlement. And let it further be recalled that twice before we have suspended our bombing, once for thirty-seven days, without any reciprocal act of de-escalation from the other side, and without any sign from them of a willingness to negotiate.

Nevertheless, let me say that, in this matter, the United States is willing once again to take the first step. We are prepared to

order a cessation of all bombing of North Viet-Nam—the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side. We therefore urge that the Government in Hanoi be asked the following question, to which we would be prepared to receive either a private or a public response:

Would it, in the interest of peace, and in response to a prior cessation by the United States of the bombing in North Viet-Nam, take corresponding and timely steps to reduce or bring to an end its own military activities against South Viet-Nam?

Another obstacle is said to be North Viet-Nam's conviction or fear that the United States intends to establish a permanent military presence in Viet-Nam. There is no basis for such a fear. The United States stands ready to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs so that peace can be restored in South Viet-Nam, and favors international machinery—either of the United Nations or other machinery—to ensure effective supervision of the withdrawal. We therefore urge that Hanoi be asked the following question also:

Would North Viet-Nam be willing to agree to a time schedule for supervised phased withdrawal from South Viet-Nam of all external forces—those of North Viet-Nam as well as those from the United States and other countries aiding South Viet-Nam?

A further obstacle is said to be disagreement over the place of the Viet Cong in the negotiations. Some argue that, regardless of different views on who controls the Viet Cong, it is a combatant force and, as such, should take part in the negotiations.

Our view on this matter was stated by President Johnson, who made clear that, as far as we are concerned, this question would not be "an insurmountable problem". We invite the authorities in Hanoi to consider whether this obstacle to negotiation may not be more imaginary than real.

Mr. President, we offer these proposals in the interest of peace in Southeast Asia. There may be other proposals. We have not been and are not now inflexible in our position. But we do believe that, whatever approach finally succeeds, it will not be one which simply declares what is happening in Viet-Nam and appeals to one side to stop while encouraging the other. Such a position can only further delay the peace we all desire. The only workable formula for a settlement will be one which is just to the basic interests of all those involved.

In this spirit we welcome discussion of this question either in the Security Council where the United States itself has raised the matter, or here in the General Assembly, and we are fully prepared to take part in any such discussion. We earnestly solicit the further initiative of any organ or any Member of the United Nations whose influence can help in this cause. Every Member has a responsibility to exert its power and influence for peace; and the greater its power and influence, the greater is this responsibility.

Now I turn to another problem, related in part to the first: the problem of how to foster a constructive relationship between the mainland of China, with its 700 million people, and the outside world. The misdirection of so much of the energies of this vast, industrious and gifted people into xenophobic displays, such as the extraordinary and alarming activities of the Red Guards; and the official policy and doctrine of promoting revolution and subversion throughout the world—these are among the most disturbing phenomena of our age. Surely, among the essentials of peace in Asia are "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies" and, specifically, "a peaceful mainland China."

Let me say categorically that it is not the policy of the United States to isolate Com-

munist China from the world. On the contrary, we have sought to limit the areas of hostility and to pave the way for the restoration of our historically friendly relations with the great people of China.

Our efforts to this end have taken many forms. Since 1955, United States representatives have held 131 bilateral diplomatic meetings in Geneva, and later in Warsaw, with emissaries from Peking.

We have sought without success to open numerous unofficial channels of communication with mainland China.

We have made it clear that we do not intend to attack, invade, or attempt to overthrow the existing regime in Peking.

And we have expressed our hope to see representatives of Peking join us and others in meaningful negotiations on disarmament, a nuclear test ban, and a ban on the further spread of nuclear weapons.

But the international community cannot countenance Peking's doctrine and policy of intervening by violence and subversion in other nations, whether under the guise of so-called wars of national liberation against independent countries or under any other guise. Such intervention finds no place in the United Nations Charter, nor in the resolutions of the General Assembly. Yet dozens of nations represented in this hall have had direct experience of these illegal activities.

It is in the light of these facts, and of our desire for a better atmosphere, that the United States has carefully considered the issues arising from the absence of representatives of Peking from the United Nations.

Two facts bear on this issue and on the attitude of my country toward any attempted solution.

First, the Republic of China on Taiwan is a founding member of the United Nations and its rights are clear. The United States will vigorously oppose any effort to exclude the representative of the Republic of China from the United Nations in order to put representatives of Communist China in their place.

The second fact is that Communist China, unlike anyone else in the history of this Organization, has put forward special and extraordinary terms for consenting to enter the United Nations. In addition to the expulsion of the Republic of China, there are also demands to transform and pervert this Organization from its Charter purposes—some of them put forward as recently as yesterday.

What can be the cause of this attitude? We cannot be sure, but we do know that it comes from a leadership whose stated program is to transform the world by violence. It comes from a leadership which is opposed to any discussion of a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam. It would almost seem that these leaders wish to isolate their country from a world—and from a United Nations—that they cannot transform and control. Indeed, they have already brought their country to a degree of isolation that is unique in the world today—an isolation not only from the United States and its allies, but from most of the non-aligned world and even from most of the Communist nations. Many, not only the United States, have sought improved relations and have been rebuffed.

At this moment in history, therefore, Mr. President, the basic question about the relation between Communist China and the United Nations is a question to which only the leaders in Peking can give the answer. Will they refrain from putting forward clearly unacceptable terms; and are they prepared to assume the obligations of the United Nations Charter, in particular the basic Charter obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state?

The world—and my Government—will listen most attentively for a helpful response to these questions. We hope it will come

soon—the sooner the better. Like many other members here, the United States has the friendliest historic feelings toward the great Chinese people, and looks forward to the occasion when they will once again enrich, rather than endanger, the fabric of the world community, and, in the spirit of the Charter, "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

Mr. President, I have dwelt on these great and thorny issues of Asia because they are of far more than regional importance. Progress toward their solution would visibly brighten the atmosphere of international relations all over the world. It would enable the United Nations to turn a new corner—to apply itself with new energy to the great tasks of reconciliation and peaceful construction which lie before us in every part of the globe.

Such peaceful construction is needed above all in the less developed areas. It is needed in Southeast Asia, today a region of conflict but also a region of vast undeveloped resources—where my country is prepared to make a most substantial contribution to the development of the whole region including North Viet-Nam. It is needed in the Western Hemisphere, where, under the bold ideals of the Alliance for Progress, the states of Latin America are already carrying out a far-reaching, peaceful process of economic and social development.

In no area are the tasks of economic development more important than on the continent of Africa—represented in this hall by the delegates of thirty-seven nations. Last May, in commemorating the anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, the President suggested ways in which the United States, as a friend of Africa, might help with some of that continent's major economic problems. Our efforts in this entire field are now entering a new stage as we begin to carry out the recommendations of a special committee appointed to review United States participation in African development programs, both bilateral and multilateral.

But the economic side of peace cannot stand alone. The time is past when either peace or material progress could be founded on the domination of one people, or one race or one group, by another. Yet attempts to do just that still continue in southern Africa today. As a result, the danger to peace in that area is real.

My Government holds strong views on these problems. We are not, and never will be, content with a minority government in Southern Rhodesia. The objective we support for that country remains as it was stated last May: "to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to all the people of Rhodesia—not just 6 percent of them."

Nor can we ever be content with a situation such as that in Southwest Africa, where one race holds another in intolerable subjection under the false name of apartheid.

The decision of the International Court, in refusing to touch the merits of the question of Southwest Africa, was most disappointing. But the application of law to this question does not hang on that decision alone. South Africa's conduct remains subject to obligations reaffirmed by earlier advisory opinions of the Court whose authority is undiminished. Under these opinions, South Africa cannot alter the international status of the territory without the consent of the United Nations; and South Africa remains bound to accept United Nations supervision, submit annual reports to the General Assembly, and "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants."

This is no time for South Africa to take refuge in a technical finding of the International Court, which did not deal with the substantive merits of the case. The time is overdue for South Africa to accept its obli-

gations to the international community in regard to Southwest Africa. Continued violation by South Africa of its plain obligations to the international community would necessarily require all members to take such an attitude into account in their relationships with South Africa.

Mr. President, many other questions of significance will engage our attention during this session of the General Assembly. Foremost among them are questions of disarmament and arms control, of which the most urgent are the completion of a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and the extension of the limited test ban treaty. Remaining differences on these issues can and must be resolved on a basis of mutual compromise.

Finally, I wish to speak of one further matter of great concern both to the United Nations and to my country: the draft treaty to govern activities in outer space including the moon and other celestial bodies.

Major progress has been made in the negotiation of this important treaty, but several issues remain. One of these concerns the question of reporting by space powers on their activities on celestial bodies. A second issue concerns access by space powers to one another's installations on celestial bodies. On both of these points the United States, at the most recent meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on Outer Space, made significant compromise proposals in the interest of early agreement.

Unfortunately, the USSR has not responded constructively to these proposals. Instead, it has insisted on still another matter: a provision requiring states which grant tracking facilities to one country to make the same facilities available to all others—without reciprocity and without regard to the wishes of the granting state. The obligation proposed by the USSR was unacceptable to many countries participating in the outer-space discussions, and was supported only by a very small number of East European states.

Tracking facilities are a matter for bilateral negotiation and agreement. The United States has held such discussions and reached such agreements with a number of countries on a basis of mutual commitment and common advantage. France and the European Space Research Organization have also established widespread tracking networks on a similar basis. It is, of course, open to the USSR and any other space power to proceed in exactly the same way.

I should like to state today my Government's interest in bilateral cooperation in tracking of space vehicles on the basis of mutual benefits, and I should like to make an offer to help resolve this impasse: If the USSR desires to provide for tracking coverage from United States territory, we for our part, are prepared to discuss with Soviet representatives the technical and other requirements involved with a view to reaching some mutually beneficial agreement. Our scientists and technical representatives can meet without delay to explore the possibilities.

The outer space treaty is too important and too urgent to be delayed. This treaty offers us the opportunity to establish, in the unlimited realm of space beyond this planet, a rule of peace and law—before the arms race has been extended into that realm. It is all the more urgent because of man's rapid strides toward landing on the moon.

By far the greater part of the work on the treaty is now behind us. We have agreed on important provisions, including major obligations in the area of arms control. We should proceed to settle the remaining subsidiary issues in a spirit of understanding so that this General Assembly may give its approval to a completed treaty before the Assembly adjourns.

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

Mr. President, it is our earnest hope that the words of the United States today on all these issues may contribute to concrete steps toward peace and a better world.

We know the difficulties but we are not discouraged. In the twenty-one turbulent years since the Charter went into effect, we of the United Nations have faced conflicts at least as great and as difficult as any that confront us today. The failure of this Organization has been prophesied many times. But all these prophesies have been disproved. Even the most formidable issues have not killed our Organization—and none will. Indeed, it has grown great and respected by facing the hardest issues and dealing forthrightly with them.

There is no magic in the United Nations save what we its members, bring to it. And that magic is a simple thing; our irreducible awareness of our common humanity and our consequent will to peace. Without the awareness and that will, these buildings would be an empty shell. With them, we have here the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the reconciliation of conflicts and the building of the better future for which all mankind yearns.

A BILL TO ENCOURAGE THE INCLUSION OF LOSS RAIL CARRIERS IN RAILROAD MERGERS

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide an income tax incentive to the possible merger partners of small, debt-ridden rail carriers through the means of a full carryover of net operating losses of the smaller carrier to the new railroad corporation formed by a merger. This bill, I believe would assist such railroads as the debt-ridden Erie-Lackawanna Railroad in their efforts to be included as a part of a major rail system in the East through merger proceedings.

With a long-term debt of \$345 million, and operating losses in 9 out of the last 10 years amounting to \$117 million for tax purposes, it is no wonder that the Erie-Lackawanna is so unattractive as a merger candidate. In addition, any merger partner would have to be prepared to either take over the Erie-Lackawanna payroll of more than \$9 million per month by employing that railroad's workers, or assume an obligation in line with the standard Washington conditions imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission of providing each worker laid off with 60 percent of his pay for the next 5 years.

Under the present law, loss carryovers can be used in a merger of railroads of not too unequal size. This is not the case with a merger between the smaller debt-ridden carriers such as the Erie-Lackawanna with any of the three major Eastern giants, the C. & O., B. & O., the Norfolk and Western, or the proposed Pennsylvania-New York Central. Nor is there any carryover of net operating losses where the assets of an insolvent railroad, such as the New Haven, are transferred to another railroad. My bill, if enacted, would eliminate these inequities.

The continuing losses from commuter service plaguing the Erie-Lackawanna and other small carriers has created resistance to merger on the part of the larger rail systems and even the ICC. The ICC could require the inclusion of the smaller systems, commuter service and all, as a condition to approval of any merger proposals involving the large rail networks. But the Agency is undoubtedly aware of the fact that such a requirement could be challenged in court on the grounds that it would not conform to the best interests of promoting a sound rail transportation policy. My bill, if enacted, would both assist the larger carriers in meeting the impact of merger with loss rail lines, and would provide the ICC with sufficient reason for the Agency to require the continuation of the necessary commuter service by the merged lines.

My bill would allow a 10-year period to be used, rather than the standard 7-year period, for calculating carryover losses. It would apply only in the case of regulated rail carriers, defined by law as a corporation with 80 percent or more of its gross income originating through the furnishing or sale of transportation. The merged corporations, as a new corporate entity, would have to continue as a regulated rail carrier to benefit from the tax carryover provisions. I would estimate that in the case of the Erie-Lackawanna, the Treasury might lose up to \$42 million in taxes following a merger.

The potential loss of 16,000 jobs, and of rights-of-way that might later have to be repurchased for a mass transportation system, as well as the need for maintaining important freight and commuter service, clearly outweighs any temporary revenue loss.

The legislation I have introduced today is similar in nature to H.R. 10542, introduced by my colleague from New York, Mr. KEOGH, whose experience in these matters as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means is highly valued. I would hope that early hearings could be held on this measure, given the fact that the question of the inclusion of the small rail carriers in mergers of the large eastern railroads and the continuation of commuter service is still being determined before the ICC and the courts. Action on the part of the Congress on this proposal would be of great benefit in the development of a national rail merger policy at the national level, particularly here in the Northeast.

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEW BATTLE CRY FOR FARMERS

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, after years of congressional effort aimed at strengthening farm income in the face of adverse market conditions, Congress must now give its attention to protecting the farmer from selective price fixing by the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The farmer is entitled to full parity income in the marketplace, but he is being denied it because the President and his aids arbitrarily use a variety of devices to drive down farm prices.

This is a reversal of the historic role of government in farm problems.

For the first time in American history the power of government is being used to beat farm prices down below parity.

The Congress has been slow to recognize this change, and action to curb arbitrary control over farm prices must be given top priority when the next session convenes in January.

Singling out farmers for punishment—through dumping grains, curbing hides exports, urging consumer boycotts and the like—is patently unfair in times of inflation. Farmers today are in a worsening cost-price squeeze.

The parity ratio—which measures the prices they get with what they must pay for goods and services—is 20 percent below the fair level. The new legislative battle cry of farmers must be: "Full parity in the marketplace."

Farm operating expenses are running about 4 percent higher than a year ago and still climbing. Across-the-board price controls are one thing. Selective punishment of farmers is quite another.

A logical first step toward protecting the farmer in his right to full parity in the marketplace is to insulate Government grain holdings from normal market channels. With that in mind I have proposed that Government wheat stocks cannot be sold for less than \$2 a bushel. Similar limits should be placed on Government sales of other grains.

PROVIDING FOR COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES IN THE BENEFITS PAYABLE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder.

Inflation steals from everyone, young and old alike, but hurts especially those elderly Americans who live on pensions or other fixed incomes.

During the period from 1958 to 1965, the consumer price index increased over 8 percentage points. The cost of services, which our older citizens are more likely to need than our younger citizens, increased over 16 percentage points. When services, exclusive of rent, are considered, the increase was 18 percentage points. Yet during this 7-year period, social security beneficiaries received no increase in social security benefits.

Inflation is now a fact of life. Prices continue to soar upward. There is an urgent need for such a change in the law as this bill proposes. Our older people and others who live on fixed incomes simply cannot stand the pace of this administration's inflation.

There is a precedent for such a provision as I am introducing. Congress, in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, section 1102, provided for an automatic increase in civil service retirement pensions when there has been an increase of 3 percent or more in the consumer price index.

Why should our elderly people and others continue to suffer while runaway inflation further destroys the purchasing power of their dollar? I urge immediate passage of the bill.

OPPOSITION TO WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. WALKER of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called war on poverty and any measure that would extend this program in any degree.

I have seen, in my own congressional district many examples of how these funds are "misused" for strictly political purposes. I have seen examples on how "poverty" money has been used in my State to promote racial unrest. I have seen how the taxpayer's money has been taken by Great Society bureaucrats in high salaried positions in the name of helping the poor. And, I have seen tax money used in my State to pay rent on toilets, drinking fountains, refrigerators, and so forth, when in fact the property was claimed to be rent free.

The questionable activities of the war on poverty by no means ends with the State of Mississippi. The entire nationwide program has proven ineffective, and a burden on the American taxpayer.

At the present time we have committed approximately 300,000 servicemen—and no telling how many dollars—to fight the spread of communism in the Far East. There is no question in my mind that we should be there, but I do strongly question the wisdom of conducting a so-called war on poverty at home with funds we should be using to provide equipment and supplies to our military men.

We in the Congress over the past several months have heard much about various shortages in equipment and supplies in Vietnam, trucks, medical equipment, and ammunition. There has also been considerable talk on the subject of a possible tax increase to cover the added cost of the war in Vietnam. In my judgment, there is no excuse whatsoever for our country to experience either military shortages—or monetary shortages.

Our taxes are quite high enough if we would cut this political shackle from the taxpayer. In the President's budget message this year, he proposed sharp cutbacks in our school lunch program and the school milk program—these programs have proven effective for years

now, yet Great Society officials say they are interested in helping the poor. I am afraid that the only help the Great Society wants to give to the poor is that which binds them to the Great Society's political machine. The administration claims that it is exercising prudence in its spending. Yet, it asks the Congress to provide this poverty bill calling for even greater expenditures than last year's program. This increase must be covered by the taxpayer when threats of a tax increase is at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to weigh carefully the many pitfalls of this bill, the enormous responsibility we in Congress have to our servicemen in Vietnam, as well as our responsibility to the American taxpayer during this time of inflation, to set the example toward curbing domestic spending.

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CURTIS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMPLICATIONS

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complications in foreign affairs are a growing concern to the public, and I am very pleased to note the leadership struggle against communism that is developing at the grassroots level.

Typical of this leadership are speakers who are discussing this subject with their fellow Americans in a most effective fashion. I insert in the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks, a speech by Mr. Walter V. Chopyk, of Buffalo, N.Y., the public relations director of the Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York, who, in addition, is secretary of the Erie County Planning Department.

His remarks were delivered at a meeting of the Kiwanis Club in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on July 21. His topic, "Berlin West; Berlin, East," was delivered in line with Captive Nations Week, July 17-23:

REMARKS OF MR. WALTER V. CHOPYK TO THE WILKES-BARRE KIWANIS CLUB IN WILKES-BARRE, PA., ON JULY 21, 1966, AFTER SLIDES AND BRIEF TALK ON "BERLIN, WEST; BERLIN, EAST," IN LINE WITH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMEMORATION

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, you have heard my comments on Berlin, West; Berlin, East. You have seen the pictures I secured while in West Germany and directly on the site of that infamous and ominous construction dividing illegally—a formerly free nation. I have expressed my opinions clearly after interviewing many there and seeing (with my own eyes) this terrible wall of the enslaved—for that is exactly the term we can also apply to East Germany in this critical hour in this ominous year of 1966.

No one likes to hear this, I know, and few care to discuss this dividing line—cutting in half the jewel-like city of Berlin, proper. For it really is this (in appearance, and especially at night when millions of varicolored lights illuminate the free side which we call West Berlin.

Before I speak on the Captive Nations Week, I ask you sincerely to remember that we can no longer go on making mistakes such as permitting (as we did and our other allies can be so indicted) words to be given—lines to be written in so-called agreements and then—weakly submit when these are broken suddenly and a nation or a city thus becomes enslaved overnight.

This is (as you and the world knows) the important week of the year—(so proclaimed by our President and many Presidents before him)—Captive Nations Week.

Here—in every major city—we gather to commemorate and to honor the nations and their brave people—now absorbed into that—prison of nations erroneously called the Soviet Union. There are 28 (and I repeat sharply) 28 formerly free, autonomous East European nations (East Germany definitely included) all of which are enslaved, exploited, under dictation from the Muscovites daily and we so easily tend to forget this factual and appalling reality.

In passing, may I say, that ere long we will be sharply called upon to do something more than honor and commemorate these—the enslaved nations. Humans can endure just so much after having lived in freedom, masters of their own ventures, governments and destiny. The cracking point comes suddenly and then, regardless, slaves arise to throw off their shackles. East Europe could be called a tinder-box today—waiting for a flare to ignite those feelings (inherent in those, all of whom love freedom) and then, who can predict the outcome.

West Berlin (living in freedom, yet literally rubbing shoulders with slavery) is a beacon to those in eastern slavery in Europe and may be a pivot, a key territory for Western diplomatic moves in Europe as time shows the way and hour for decisions.

We must never overlook such important key facts (nor forget the east Europeans fate—their faithful people living here, never forget and still wage battle for liberation of their old homelands as this Captive Nations Week is full evidence). We must remember East Europe's fate even though crafty, so-called friendly Muscovites try now to direct our minds towards such places as Vietnam, etc. The Soviet would like to consolidate their ill-gotten gains in Europe yet always—free, West Berlin emanates the promise that freedom can be held if once obtained again.

It is the fear and I repeat—the fear (the Soviet leaders live with hourly) that inner strength in many satellite nations in east Europe will suddenly gain in power and momentum—then—those in the western alliance would have to act also—and this—the Soviets fear and roundly so, as many of their recent moves will indicate. Such as, for instance (like a carrot to a donkey) relaxing tension—policies—permitting more western tourists to enter red-dominated satellites—encouraging mail to flow East-West more freely—sending Red athletes and artists out of dominated countries, etc.

Time does not permit further discourse regarding East Europe and the Soviet enslaved there. But I leave this comment—any failure by the western allies to honor their guarantees (now remaining) to West Germany will have serious repercussions and even the fate of the free world could hang in balance for our allies are becoming hard to locate—when the need arises—have you noticed?

Again, in passing and as a service to the Soviet-enslaved nations at this time of the spotlight on Captive Nations Week, I bring up again, the idea that the implementation of the United Nations Charter regarding "self determination of nations" and free elections be tabled again and openly discussed and considered at the U.N. (and this because the time is opportune when so many new nations are emerging and being openly recognized—especially by the Soviet Govern-

September 29, 1966

23544

is done in the bureaucracy to influence Congressional action is illegal. The law (Title 18, Section 1913, of the U.S. Code) flatly forbids both officers and employees of the Executive Branch to use appropriated funds for the purpose of lobbying.

CONFORMITY—OR ELSE

Increasingly, the Administration operates a highly developed system of political rewards and punishments which politicians call "arm twisting." For example, White House emissaries offered Democratic Sen. E. I. BARTLETT of Alaska decisive backing for a \$10-million program to upgrade housing for Eskimos (which he had hitherto unsuccessfully proposed) if he would switch his vote to support this year's controversial rent-subsidy program. BARTLETT agreed, and the Senate approved the potential \$6-billion measure, 46 to 45. BARTLETT later said, "I'm not proud of myself."

There has been special obedience training for the 66 freshman House Democrats. So they would parrot only approval, the Democratic National Committee has drafted their speeches and press blurbs. Also, as a follow-up to a Presidential message, "Mike N. Manatos, the White House liaison man for the Senate, personally handed out ghosted reaction" for their use, the Washington Star reported. "Sheets were neatly typed, suitable for immediate insertion in the records of any day's Congressional debate. Uniformly, the White House speechwriters tended toward expansive praise of the President's leadership."

Meanwhile, the White House arranged for them to rendezvous regularly with bosses of the government's heftiest spending programs. "The purpose," the Washington Post reported, "is to mobilize the resources of the federal government to help re-elect" these Johnson supporters. Each freshman was asked what federal handouts he wanted poured into his district. "Administration officials have been coached to go along with any reasonable requests," the Washington Star disclosed.

Thirty-two senior officials stopped work to perform for Representative RICHARD C. WHITE of Texas. Before 45 constituents invited to Washington, they wasted two days adding up federal money suddenly available for WHITE's district—grants for everything from football fields to health centers. Extolling a White bill to extend a Texas canal, Richard Shunick of the Bureau of Reclamation exclaimed, "The U.S. would pick up the whole tab and not charge those who benefit."

The Democratic National Committee meanwhile leased a nationwide communications network so the freshmen could phone announcements of their prizes to newspapers and radio stations back home. Representative JOHN R. HANSEN breathlessly announced a new post office for Glenwood, Iowa. "Why?" exclaimed the dumbfounded mayor, noting that the local post office had just been remodeled.

In return, the Administration demands conformity. Freshman Representative JOHN C. CULVER of Iowa once mustered enough independence to oppose a White House-sponsored bill. When he sought to explain to constituents via the communications network, the National Committee curtly refused him the services it had so eagerly offered in the past.

Representative OTIS PIKE, a liberal Democrat from Long Island, once had his post-office patronage abruptly cut off for failing to support Executive Branch legislation. Last spring, because he concluded that the rent-subsidy bill was bad for the country, he got a warning call from the White House, followed by a barrage of others from Administration men. Finally, a messenger let him know that a vote against rent subsidies might cost his district an important research project.

"There are so many ways the Executive Branch can exert pressure," PIKE explains. "There are post offices to be built, inlets to be dredged; there is money available for poverty and school programs, for agriculture programs and defense programs. There are decisions to be made on locating veterans hospitals and nuclear reactors. The accumulation of powers in the Executive Branch, at the expense of Congress, is so huge that our system of checks and balances has largely broken down."

The threats, bribes, payoffs and persecutions all add up to what liberal commentator Eric Sevareid calls "a curious kind of intimidation." So many members of Congress have been brought to heel by it that Sevareid finds "the once exalted title of Senator or Representative has lost much of its prestige."

THE BRAVE ONES

Yet there do remain strong men, liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, who fight to make Congress the institution it was meant to be. They often disagree, but they share the common qualities of courage, integrity and independence.

Republican Rep. TOM CURTIS studies late at night, analyzing and originating legislation. Then each week or so he flies home to St. Louis to explain issues at people's seminars. "A Congressman's job," CURTIS says, "should be to give his people independent representation."

Rep. EDITH GREEN (Dem.) from Oregon cries out for creative debate. Though a liberal supporter of Great Society legislation, she dares to question its sloppy drafting and the steamrolling. "We have in the House a determined effort to silence those in disagreement," she says.

Just last spring, labor leaders warned Democrat Sen. FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio that they would unseat him if he voted to uphold right-to-work laws. "The people elected me to use my own reasoning and conscience," LAUSCHE replied. "I will not be a political slave to any special group." And Republican Sen. JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware cast the decisive vote which cost stockholders of his state's most influential corporations, Du Pont and Christiana, a half-billion dollars in tax exemptions. "I'm bound by my oath to seek answers that are best for all the people, not just a few," he declared.

As you get ready to go to the polls this November, ask yourself how your Representative and Senators measure up against such men and women. Scrutinize their voting records and find out whether they are legislators or puppets. Judge whether their first concern is themselves or the nation. Consider whether they will help wipe out the moral and intellectual corruption besetting Washington or whether they're content to "go along." Find out whether they will join the battle to make Congress an independent branch of the government which takes orders only from the electorate. Whether you vote for a Democrat or a Republican is not nearly as important as whether you vote for integrity.

A \$90-A-DAY OEO CONSULTANT GETS POVERTY CONTRACT

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, early this year, a \$105,247 poverty contract was signed to train community action, work experience, and adult basic education officials in Iowa. The organization designated to train these officials was Social, Educational Research & Development, Inc.—SERD—whose incorporator,

president, treasurer, and apparent one-man corporation was Mr. John W. McCollum, a \$90-a-day OEO consultant.

We made a mistake by going to SERD—

Said Mr. C. J. Johnson, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction—we could have done as well without SERD.

Mr. Speaker, the SERD contract has been widely criticized in the Des Moines, Iowa, area. It not only failed miserably in its assigned task of training poverty officials, but it is reported that guest speakers who receive their regular pay in Federal tax dollars were paid honorariums of \$75 a day plus expenses.

This fiasco raises serious questions of conflict of interest, duplication of programs and wasteful expenditures. What justification does OEO have in negotiating a contract for this kind of service with an individual who is a high-paid consultant to OEO and whose "firm" is obviously unqualified to do the job?

How many other consultants does OEO have at \$90 a day who are receiving lucrative poverty contracts from OEO? Local and Regional officials say this contract was negotiated at the Washington level of OEO. It is obvious that this incident illustrates yet another example of taxpayers money poured down a drain instead of being used effectively to help the poor.

We would like some direct and sensible answers as to how this wasteful contract came about and what provision has been made to avoid future fiascos of this nature.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my concern over the course of the war in Vietnam and the real and urgent need to cut off supplies to the enemy in order to shorten this tragic conflict, I have, from time to time, undertaken to share with my colleagues unclassified information made available to me by the Department of Defense detailing the nature and extent of free world shipping into North Vietnam as well as the "backdoor" aid the Vietcong derives from Cambodia. I know most Members share my concern over this trading with the enemy by our so-called friends and allies, and I am grateful for the support that has been given my efforts to prohibit United States aid to any foreign country involved in this traffic. I know also that most Members have been equally concerned over the administration's apparent willingness to tolerate this flow of supplies to the enemy and its reluctance to take full and effective action against it.

NO TRADE OR NO AID

Just last week, in fact, the Administration in its foreign aid appropriations bill requested authority to continue aid to countries shipping supplies—including war goods—to North Vietnam if the

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23543

cause the farmer is better organized. When it comes to choosing sides, maybe Mr. Freeman, and now Mr. Schnittker, had better make sure the side they choose wants them. Some 80 percent of the farmers in the area where I am from might have different ideas.

These farmers, large or small, are going to remember that this same Department is the one which lifts cheese import restrictions, to the detriment of the American dairy farmer; and uses Defense Department cutbacks on pork buying to control the hog prices, and promotes beef imports in competition with American farmers; and whose Commodity Credit Corporation dumped millions of bushels of wheat and corn on markets which were then bringing the farmer only 80 percent of parity; and finally the Department which conveniently brushes aside the fact that the farmer is also faced with inflation.

WHAT YOUR VOTE CAN DO FOR CONGRESS

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I have ever read a more timely article than the one written by Charles Stevenson in the October 1966 Reader's Digest. Entitled "What Your Vote Can Do for Congress," it surely hits the nail right on the head.

The late Senator Jim Reed, constitutional Democrat from Missouri, once said that about the most contemptuous person he knew was a "congressional White House cat who for a little cream would sell the interests of his constituents down the river." Modern day rubber-stamps are no better than that.

The great article should be read by every interested American:

WHAT YOUR VOTE CAN DO FOR CONGRESS—THE URGENT NEED THIS NOVEMBER IS THE ELECTION, NOT JUST OF REPUBLICANS OR DEMOCRATS, BUT OF COURAGEOUS MEN WHO WILL BE TRUE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE
(By Charles Stevenson)

This year's national elections on November 8 are as important as any in history. The future of constitutional government could depend upon how you vote; not Republican, Democratic, liberal or conservative, but whether you elect Senators and Representatives who will fight to save Congress from the forces now destroying it.

If this statement seems incredible, consider, as one example, the role of Congress in the S.S. Yarmouth Castle tragedy.

Certain money-hungry operators have been putting rickety old ships into the Caribbean-cruise business under foreign flags, a practice which enables them to evade U.S. safety regulations. Thousands of unsuspecting Americans assume the ships must be safe because they are permitted to operate out of American ports. Alarmed, legitimate American shipping men and concerned legislators of both parties joined to seek a law compelling the dilapidated vessels to meet U.S. standards.

"Floating firetraps . . . could result in unspeakable horror and death," exploded Hoyt Haddock of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee. "Risking the lives of our citizens . . ." warned Rear Adm. W. J. McNeil of the Committee of American Steamship

Lines. The leaky, 38-year-old S.S. Yarmouth Castle was branded especially dangerous. "A shining example" of an unfit ship, summed up Rep. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD of California.

But then the Executive Branch jumped in, claiming the urgently needed safety measures would represent "unreasonable discrimination against foreign-flag vessels." "After the word came down from on high," says MAILLIARD, "apparently Congress was afraid to act and it just let the proposals die." Two and a half months later the Yarmouth Castle caught fire as it wallowed through the sea. The general alarm wasn't rung. The sprinkler system was ineffective. Fire hoses lacked pressure. So flames raged through the tinderbox wooden walls. And, amid screams and terror, 90 men and women perished.

This incident is shockingly typical of the way Congress is surrendering its constitutional legislative role to the Executive Branch. Thus it is helping to bring about a perilous change in our form of government. Our founding fathers deeply feared concentration of governmental power, so they clearly divided authority: the Congress to make our laws, the Courts to interpret them, the Executive to administer them. And Congress was to be the national forum where the voices of all the people could be heard through elected representatives directly responsible to them.

FELL-MELL LEGISLATION

Now, however, as stressed by Prof. Samuel P. Huntington of Harvard, "Congress has conceded not only the initiative in originating legislation . . . it has also lost the dominant influence it once had in shaping the content of legislation." Scarcely ever does Congress attempt to refine complicated, often revolutionary legislation written by Administration bureaucrats unanswerable to the public, and merely dispatched to Congress to be rubber-stamped.

The result is a crumbling of traditional checks and balances that frightens liberal and conservative alike. "For heaven's sake," Rep. E. J. GURNEY of Florida cried out in disgust on the floor of the House, "let us retain a little self-respect and independence as a legislative body and have the courage to do some of the things on our own once in a while."

Last April, for instance, President Johnson called on Congress to compel the taxpayers to contribute at least \$381 million in supplementary interest so that bankers would find it profitable to buy up low-interest loans made by the government under its various subsidy programs. The receipts from this inflated sale of government assets could then be represented as normal income that would reduce the Administration's spending deficit. Critics of all stripes denounced this gimmick.

"Just a government subsidy to the banking interests," declared the liberal Americans for Democratic Action, ". . . will increase interest rates for all borrowers. . . . accelerate the tightening of the money market." Here was a measure which cried out for Congress to solicit expert views, to deliberate, to take into account the interests of all Americans.

But what happened? House Banking and Currency Committee Democrats in caucus agreed that the measure "stank," to quote one of them. Yet when they began hearings, these men were summoned outside one by one to take orders phoned from the White House. The committee permitted only two witnesses to testify—both sent by the President. In three hours the committee obediently approved the bill, involving nearly \$11 billion. The House obligingly followed suit. Since, interest rates have shot up to a 40-year high, making it hard for families to buy or sell homes and for industry to finance job-creating expansion.

"A good bill can stand debate, deliberation and full inquiry," warns Rep. BURT TALCOTT, a California Republican. "Suppression of debate and of the free expression of opinion will inexorably undermine the majority, Congress and the nation." But it goes on all the time.

The President's bill to subsidize the arts compels every taxpayer to finance whatever painter, musician, woodcarver, wire bender or dancer our federal administrators want to help support. Many artists themselves opposed the measure as restricting rather than nourishing art.

Yet up to the very moment the House Labor and Education Committee met to consider the final bill, Republican members were denied even a look at it. Rep. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN of Michigan, now a Senator, asked that it at least be read aloud. Instead, the committee hurriedly put through previously undiscussed amendments, then approved the revolutionary legislation—all in less than 15 minutes.

In this pell-mell fashion, Congress has been passing even more momentous laws without being aware of what the legislation would do. It voted Medicare with most of the membership thinking it was providing only for the elderly. But an unnoticed section of the measure enables any state to furnish medical care for anyone regardless of age—with taxpayers all over the country required to pick up the bills. Now the Administration quietly has admitted that Medicare may cost one billion dollars more a year than expected!

LEFT TO DISCRETION

Today the Executive Branch is making the law. It forces enactment of bills so vaguely written that it can make them mean just about anything it wants.

In the \$2.3-billion poverty-program legislation, for example, 87 phrases such as "in his discretion" and "as he shall deem necessary or appropriate" give bureaucrats an incredibly free hand.

Thus \$256,720 that was voted to help the poor in Appalachia is going instead to a branch library in well-off Pittsburgh. And thus the Department of Housing and Urban Development is enabled to make an outright gift of \$81,351 for tennis courts and a 1.6-acre park in Somerset, a swank Washington suburb whose 400 families, most of them uppercrust government employees, boast a median income of \$17,273, the highest in the entire Washington area. Meanwhile, as the outraged Washington Post pointed out, the adjacent District of Columbia is left without funds to light playgrounds "needed by tens of thousands" of poor children.

Further reaching for power inevitably lies in prospect. Even as the Executive Branch ignores the clearly written law by refusing to submit five-year estimates of what new federal programs will cost, Budget Director Charles L. Schultze tells Congress it no longer should bother about costs. Instead, he insists, Congress should merely approve "goals" dreamed up by the bureaucrats. "We're not sure that it is always wise to express the authorizations in dollar terms," Schultze testified.

The bureaucracy and the White House are as one in these seizures of power. Ever since New Deal days the bureaucracy has been evolving its own elite—career administrators, top technicians, specialists—who operate the programs and plan what they want to enact next. The President often buys their ideas; then departmental agents known as "legislative liaison" men fan out over Capitol Hill, cultivating Congress and, in the name of supplying information, actively lobbying for the agreed-upon legislation.

"Technically," says Daniel M. Berman, professor of Government and Public Administration at American University, in his book *In Congress Assembled*, "all the work that

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23545

President determined it to be in the national interest. As I could not possibly conceive how it would be in our national interest to continue aid to those supplying our enemy I urged that the requested authority be denied and was gratified that the House agreed with my position. As it is, South Vietnam has been getting little help from our so-called friends. There is no valid reason why we should reward those aiding the enemies of freedom in southeast Asia.

HANOI TRADE: THE OTHER HALF

Particularly disturbing, as well, has been the administration's policy, up to only a few months ago, of hiding under a cloak of unnecessary secrecy, full information about this trade. Until April of this year the administration was telling the American people only half of the story about the number of free world ships arriving in North Vietnam. Misinformation and distortion on this subject still continue to appear.

The September 19 issue of Newsweek magazine contains the following "Periscope" sighting:

SHIPS TO HAIPHONG

Only a few "Free World" vessels still carry supplies to Haiphong and other North Vietnam ports. Maritime Administration watchdogs report seven British, four Cypriot, two Greek and one Maltese ships between January 26th and July 14th.

Newsweek bases its information obviously on the list issued by the U.S. Maritime Administration of ships prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes out of U.S. ports because they had sailed to North Vietnam. This so-called blacklist, which I urged the President to establish but which the Administration inexplicably waited until February 11 of this year to announce—retroactive to January 25—is not an accurate measure of free world trade with the Hanoi regime. It records only the names of ships, not how many times they have gone to North Vietnam.

The following free-world-flag ships appeared on Report No. 7, list of foreign-flag vessels arriving in North Vietnam on or after January 26, 1966, issued September 8 by the Maritime Administration:

Flag of registry, name of ship:	Gross tonnage
British:	
<i>Arctara</i>	5,795
<i>Greenford</i>	2,964
<i>Isabel Erica</i>	7,105
<i>Milford</i>	1,889
<i>Santa Granda</i>	7,229
<i>Shienfoon</i>	7,127
<i>Shirley Christine</i>	6,724
Cypriot:	
<i>Acme</i>	7,173
<i>Amfitriti</i>	7,147
<i>Amon</i>	7,229
<i>Antonia II</i>	7,303
Greek:	
<i>Agenor</i>	7,139
<i>Alkon</i>	7,150
Maltese:	
<i>Amalia</i>	7,304

Information provided me by the Department of Defense reveals that during the period referred to by Newsweek, there were actually 22 free-world-flag vessels trading with North Vietnam rather than 14 which they reported. Furthermore, since January 1, 1966, there have been

some 30 different free-world vessels calling at the ports of Haiphong, Hon Gay and Campha. What is even more misleading about Newsweek's report is that it completely overlooks the fact that these 22 ships have made a total of 41 trips to North Vietnam between January 25 and July 31. A look through Newsweek's "Periscope" is like looking through the wrong end of a telescope.

It makes reality appear smaller than it is.

In assessing the full impact of this trade, it is not just the number of ships involved but the volume of cargo actually delivered that is important.

To put the record straight, Mr. Speaker, I insert a chart indicating by country of registry the free-world ship arrivals in North Vietnam during the first 8 months of 1966.

Month	United Kingdom	Greece	Italy	Cyprus	Malta	Total
January	13	3	1	1		18
February	11	1				12
March	5			1		6
April	4	1			1	6
May	4	1				5
June	1	1		2	1	5
July	1					1
August	1			1	1	3
Total	40	7	1	7	3	58

FREE WORLD SHIPPING STILL IMPORTANT

As compared with the traffic of last year, this is a decided improvement. This shows something could be done. This also shows clearly that more must be done. That this traffic exists at all is appalling and I will not be satisfied so long as there is one free world ship helping to supply the enemy. Certainly this is not a time to be minimizing this deplorable trade and its impact on the war effort. In fact, information I have received within the past few days concerning the free world ships arriving in Haiphong during August of this year included cargo reports which strongly suggest the presence of goods of strategic value to keep Communist military supplies moving south. The nature and extent of this shipping must continue to have the closest scrutiny and the American people should be told the facts.

A BELATED "BLACKLIST" WITH LOOPHOLES

While it has its weaknesses, the establishment of the "blacklist" is significant in that it put the U.S. Government on public record for the first time as doing something positive to stop this trading with the enemy. In retrospect it is clearly incredible that during 1964 when there were 401 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam and during 1965 when there were 256, there was no such "blacklist," with some of these same ships actually coming to U.S. ports and, at least in one instance, picking up U.S. Government cargoes. This is even more shocking because during 1964 and 1965 there were more free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam than there were Communist-flag ship arrivals.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined a score of other Members in sponsoring legislation to close our ports for private as well as Government business to all ships of any foreign shipping interest which permits any of the vessels under its control to trade with the Hanoi regime. The administration has recommended against this legislation, even though for a time it was given "de facto" enforcement through the extra legal boycott initiated by patriotic longshoremen. Why, I ask, Mr. President does your administration oppose closing our ports to all shipping

interests that are helping to supply the enemy?

RED-FLAG SHIPPING UP

While there has been an apparent decline in free world trade to North Vietnam in 1966 it is to be especially noted that there has been at the same time an increase in Communist-flag shipping. Although I cannot be specific because of the nature of the information, I can say—based upon general knowledge—that the increase in Communist-flag shipping is most alarming and shows clearly the vital importance of outside supplies to North Vietnam's war effort. It is generally known that these ships carry not only oil but military hardware as well. It is equally evident that without this source of supply, Ho Chi Minh would be unable to maintain the present level of aggression against us and our allies in South Vietnam. Yet we continue to just watch this trade and collect statistics, while at the same time sending more and more boys into South Vietnam to be wounded and killed as they do their best to resist an enemy who has been well armed with supplies delivered by sea.

I say we cannot just sit by and watch the war being continually escalated in South Vietnam by supplies delivered to North Vietnam in either Communist or free world ships. Our "hands off" policy with regard to the procession of ships into North Vietnam is but another example of the way in which we are fighting this war on terms dictated by the Communists. The Vietcong, to be sure, give our ships no safe conduct passes up the river to Saigon. They have, in fact, this past month successfully mined a U.S. merchant ship, the *Baton Rouge Victory*, killing seven American crewmen. Yet we, with the full might of the U.S. Navy controlling the South China Sea, just seem to drift about, taking no effective steps.

When it became apparent that the Soviets were shipping missiles into Cuba—where no U.S. men were fighting—President Kennedy risked a nuclear confrontation in stopping those ships. Everyone applauded his resolve and courage in so doing. There is no question as to how the SAM missiles entered North Vietnam and how they are being con-

tinually resupplied. Such heavy ton-nages of missiles, antiaircraft guns and ammunition can only come by sea. Yet, we are still not doing much about it even though these weapons have been shoot-ing down American fliers.

CAMBODIA'S "BACKDOOR" AID

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of the problem of cutting off the enemy's sources of supply which is equally im-portant, but with which the administra-tion has also failed to come to grips. I speak of the Vietcong's "backdoor" source of supply through Cambodia.

Following an Armed Services Commit-tee mission to South Vietnam last April, which confirmed numerous reports I had received for several months, I began urging that shipping up the Mekong River, passing right through South Viet-nam, to Cambodia be halted for two prin-ciple reasons: First, to stop the suspected flow of contraband over which I found there is no effective control; and second, to apply economic pressure on Cambodia to encourage it to live up to its alleged policy of "strict neutrality."

I have yet to talk to any knowledgeable military people who have any doubt that Cambodia is used as a Vietcong sanctu-ary and source of supply. In fact, when our subcommittee was only a few miles from the border, we were told by a Spe-cial Forces officer of the existence of three airstrips and a training ground on Cambodian soil being used by the

Vietcong. While Cambodian officials may not have full information of these activities, there is no dispute that they have openly aided the enemies of South Vietnam.

The Cambodian delegate to the United Nations has said his country "continues to support morally and politically the struggle of the brave Vietnam people against American aggression. We have never concealed the fact that in token of our solidarity with the Vietnam peo-ple we have offered medical supplies and dried fish to the National Liberation Front."

This is not neutrality.

In the past, Prince Sihanouk, the Cambodian Chief of State, has often called for better border surveillance by the International Control Commission—composed of Canada, India, and Po-land—but he always knew that Poland, in deference to North Vietnam, would not permit it. While indistinct bound-ary lines present real inspection prob-lems it would be comparatively easy to insure the "neutrality" of goods entering Cambodian ports through a meaningful examination of ship cargoes as they ar-rive and I have challenged the Cambo-dian Government to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert a chart detailing the extent of free world shipping, by country, up the Mekong River through South Vietnam en route to Cambodia during 1966.

Free world ships in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 1966

	Panama- ian	United Kingdom	French	Japanese	Nether- lands	Italy	Denmark	Total
January	19	4	10	5	1			39
February	17	3	8	6	2	1		37
March	13	3	10	6				32
April	6	2	11	4				23
May	8	1	8	2	1		1	21
June	4	3	9	5				21
July	12	2	6	6				26
Total	78	18	62	34	4	1	1	198

No one wants the war to be enlarged, whether into Cambodia or elsewhere, but the point is that the war has been carried into Cambodia by the Communists with at least the tacit permission of Prince Sihanouk. This fact cannot be ignored if a much longer, costlier, bloodier strug-gle is to be averted.

I have advocated economic, not mili-tary, pressure to be applied to Cambodia to spike this escalation before it reaches even greater proportions. A truly neu-tral Cambodia has nothing to fear.

Mr. Speaker, the situation with re-spect to the "front door" of Haiphong and the "back door" of Cambodia can-not be permitted to continue if we are to resolve this conflict. In neither World War I nor World War II were vital sup-plies permitted to reach our enemies without challenge. More recently, in the 1962 missile crisis President Kennedy did not permit the delivery of strategic weapons to Cuba and at a time when there were no American forces in combat in that country. Why, I ask, Mr. Pres-ident, if this is war, as you have told us, has your administration not done more to cut off the enemy's source of supply?

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-man from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-marks.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last June 1, I introduced H.R. 15405, to elimi-nate the oil depletion allowance. The purpose of the bill is to rectify a situa-tion of special tax advantage which is no longer justified.

When the 90th Congress convenes, as soon as possible, Congress should ex-amine the structure and undertake major reform. Most recommendations in this field were rejected when the 1964 Reve-nue Act was enacted into law.

In remarks I made on the floor of the House on June 1, I pointed to the allow-ances granted oil and other natural re-sources as a particular inequity which should be dealt with at an early date.

The repeal or substantial reduction of this deduction is but one step in the direction of ending tax favoritism.

Local and State taxation is steadily rising. In this situation Congress must insure that Federal income taxes are levied as equitably as possible, and an end to privileged treatment is a first prerequisite.

In essence, the combination of local, State, and Federal levies, along with ris-ing prices, is putting lower middle- and middle-income groups, as well as retired persons, into an intolerable squeeze, while other taxable categories are granted unjustifiable advantages.

Tax reform can substantially increase Government revenue, at a time when deficit spending is feeding the fires of inflation. Moreover, when this infla-tionary period is effectively halted, through various methods, then we can ease the brunt now unequally borne by certain taxable groups and individuals.

In order to make the Federal tax bur-den more equitable, Congress should undertake major tax reform. And I once again urge that the depletion allow-ance be made a priority item in the re-drafting of tax treatment.

GERMAN ADMIRAL SEES NEED FOR CLOSER UNION IN NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-man from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is rec-ognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-marks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, among the topics discussed with Chancellor Er-hard during his recent visit to this coun-try was cooperation in space exploration. This makes timely the conclusion and recommendations of German Vice Adm. Friedrich Ruge concerning general tech-nological cooperation among the nations of NATO.

Admiral Ruge, who has participated in foreign policy symposia in this coun-try and written extensively on NATO problems, is a member of the panel of 26 eminent scientists, scholars, and military experts established by the House Repub-lican Committee on NATO and the At-lantic Community to assist in its Atlantic studies program.

Here is Admiral Ruge's statement:

NATURE OF THE ALLIANCE

NATO is a coordinated alliance, its mem-bers are partners with equal rights though of greatly differing size and importance. In the Atlantic Council, decisions can be reached only by unanimous vote, and the Council has no powers to enforce them because it is not supranational. As a consequence, problems are far more difficult to handle than in a subordinated alliance where all the smaller partners (satellites) have to obey the orders of one hegemonic power as it is the case in the Warsaw Pact.

NATO is an alliance concluded for an in-definite period, with the proviso that single members can leave after twenty years, and in the hope that they may not do so. The best way to prevent their leaving will be to develop the alliance to closer cooperation. There is ample historical evidence that coal-itions of nations have no great life expectancy unless they succeed in evolving a closer union with a common governing authority responsi-ble at least for foreign policy and defense.

September 29, 1966

A5918

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this amendment, I believe it would force OEO to run a more economical operation, although I do not feel that the sum of \$7,000 a year is exactly economical. But, at least, we would be making one step in the direction toward requiring them to be a little more economical than they have been in the past.

Vietnam in the Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the United States are being asked to support policies in Vietnam which do not rest easily with our traditions. Most Americans resist involvement in foreign wars, but when involved, want to win. Probably the most effective means open to the administration to maintain public support for the nature and style of our operations in Vietnam is through a deepening of understanding of the dynamics of this struggle, including a careful identification of the political component.

The relationship between the Hanoi regime and the Vietcong in the south has not been discussed with the care and specificity it deserves. Both in public discussion and in private conversation with policymakers in the executive branch, I have been struck with the insistence on the total identity between the forces in the south and the north. The dogmatic position of the administration on this point does not engender confidence, but rather doubt. When policymakers are so certain about a matter inherently uncertain, larger doubts are raised about our perception with respect to other aspects of this struggle.

Earlier this year I commented on the relationship between the north and the south in the following words—page 4407 of the March 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The relationship between Hanoi and the National Liberation Front has been much discussed. Many officials of the U.S. Government have repeatedly stressed the role of Hanoi in stimulating, organizing, supplying, and directing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front. But this does not give a complete picture of the relationship between Hanoi and the forces in the south. The strong political motivation of the Communist forces must be studied carefully.

If a political movement in one country decides to extend its influence into another country, the usual procedure is to send in people to proselytize and to organize on behalf of the ideas which the political movement seeks to promote. If the organizational effort is successful, a group in the second country comes into being. Its ideology, perhaps some of its leadership, and its tactics may continue to be guided by the forces in the first country. But the group in the second country still has an independent, viable existence. The relationship between the two groups is relatively stable so long as the tactics are agreed upon. But if the first group takes a new course, then the viable

nature of the group in the second country suddenly becomes clear.

According to the figures of the Defense Department, approximately 200,000 of the Vietcong are from South Vietnam. These Vietcong and the National Liberation Front believe they are fighting for certain ideas. It would seem doubtful that they regard themselves simply as soldiers whose command loyalties run to Hanoi. Their persistence and their sacrifices could not be explained on this basis.

Thus there is the strong probability that as Hanoi has sought to organize in the South, it has at the same time created forces which, if not independent today, are potentially independent if Hanoi shifts its courses which are incompatible with the primary thrust of those fighting in the South.

Thus, if Hanoi were to pursue a course of action which would seem to the National Liberation Front to thwart and make useless the years of sacrifice, there is doubt that Hanoi could compel acceptance of this course. But even more devastating, Hanoi would be regarded as abandoning an ally in the South to which it not only owed an ideological allegiance but which it had spawned.

The United States looks at its commitment to South Vietnam as binding. Then consider how much more deeply Hanoi must feel bound to the fortunes of those whom it sponsored in the South. Because this has been my rough analysis of this relationship. I have always believed that the hope that bombing in the North would drive Hanoi out of this conflict was doomed to failure. I believe furthermore that the bombing would force Hanoi into an even more active role in the belief that events in the South would have to be speeded up as the only way for Hanoi to obtain an end to the bombing.

On the other hand, pressure against the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong forces could bring about a settlement some day. It may be that regardless of what the United States does, the fabric of the South Vietnamese society is so torn and weakened that a successful effort against the Communist forces cannot be sustained. Whatever the settlement possibilities, however, communication directly with the National Liberation Front would seem to make more sense than to force Hanoi to act as broker with its interests not necessarily paralleling those of the Liberation Front.

In any event, these matters must be looked at with care and objectivity. The great stress which the United States places on the role of the North Vietnamese must not obscure the fact that our national interests require that we make our understanding conform to reality.

My views have been reinforced by an excellent article by Bernard Fall appearing in the October 1966 issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly. Because of the importance of this question I insert a portion of his article in the RECORD:

VIETNAM IN THE BALANCE

IV

A major part of the whole Viet Nam argument revolves around a clear identification of the character of the enemy—for it is that identification which pins the label of "aggressor" on North Viet Nam (and thus justifies military action against it) or, conversely, makes the conflict largely a civil war, with the United States as the major foreign "interventionist."

A recent issue of *Foreign Affairs* presented an unusually well-argued and sophisticated case for the first view.¹ But precisely be-

cause it is so well argued, it unconsciously presents some of the arguments for the opposite viewpoint as well. And since it is almost impossible to discuss the possible rational outcomes of the Viet Nam situation as long as the true character of the adversary is in doubt—it is this writer's own belief that it lies somewhere between the two extremes presented above—the nature of the Viet Cong must be explored further before it can be definitively dismissed as "faceless."

It can be conceded in advance that any Communist member of the National Liberation Front in South Viet Nam is likewise a member of the *Lao Dong*, the Vietnamese Communist Party, and that North Viet Nam, which had without a shred of doubt won the war against France in 1954, fully expected to gain control of South Viet Nam as well either by the elections slated for July 1956 or at a later date. I am, however, inclined to doubt that Hanoi's decision to intervene in South Vietnamese affairs was prompted by any "increasing disparity between political life north and south." For it became obvious even to the blindest of optimists that, unfortunately, the political lives of both Viet Nams, far from becoming "disparate," began to resemble each other as only two extremes can, with their gradual falsification of representative processes and, finally, with their concentration camps and persecution of religious groups. The existence of a "Central Reunification Department" in Hanoi of which much is made is surely revelatory of something—until one becomes aware that West Germany, for example, has a Ministry for All-German Affairs to which, of course, East Germany and the Soviets ascribe equally sinister motives, even thought it can be safely assumed that the *Ministerium für Gesamtdeutsche Fragen* is more innocuous than any Hanoi committee with the same purpose.

It is likewise very much open to question that the intervention of Hanoi was first evidenced by a terror campaign directed against small South Vietnamese officials. In actual fact, Diem began to become oppressive as early as January 1956, when a concentration camp ordinance (No. 6 of January 11, 1956) gave the regime almost unchecked power to deal with the opposition—and the non-Communist opposition, least inured to clandestine operations, was hit hardest. It took until May 1966 for a U.S. Government agency, the Public Affairs Office in Saigon, to state candidly what was a well-known fact all along—to wit, that some of the so-called "political-religious" sects provided the hard core of the early opposition:

... Ten of the eleven [Cao-Dai] sub-sects had opposed Diem, and their leadership fled to Cambodia or went into hiding. . . . The members of the other ten sects made up the bulk of the early NLF support, although the alliance was at all times an uneasy one. . . . The [Hoa-Hao] sect in 1952 formed the Social Democratic Party as its political arm. It too challenged Diem, and its armies were smashed by ARVN in 1956. Like the Cao Dai, it was an early and major participant in the NLF. . . .

The third of the esoteric sects of Viet Nam, the Binh Xuyen, which was also smashed by Diem, also worked with the NLF in its early days.²

The decision by Diem—probably his most pregnant in terms of its future consequences—to abolish elected village government in June 1956 (again before the July 1956 election deadline, at a time when the Communists were on their best behavior) did the rest. The hated appointees became a prime target for local resentment and by March

² U.S. Mission in Viet Nam, JUSPAO Planning Office, *A Note on the Vietnamese Sects*, May 1966, p. 2-3.

¹ George A. Carver, Jr., "The Faceless Viet Cong," *Foreign Affairs*, April 1966.

most of whom have special engineering, scientific or medical qualifications.

The board has an administrative and engineering staff of 16 and an annual budget of \$485,000. Near its Los Angeles headquarters, it operates one of the world's most complete laboratories in the field of vehicular air pollution.

The newly created board promptly joined in a battle that the Los Angeles County agency had been waging for years with the automobile industry over fume controls.

DETROIT IS CRITICIZED

In a current Federal grand jury inquiry in Los Angeles, local officials have charged that the auto companies collusively dragged their feet for years on producing these controls. Detroit says it was engrossed in research.

When accessory manufacturers were on the verge of preempting the fume control business with exhaust attachments, Detroit announced in July, 1966, that it was prepared to turn out cars with built-in equipment.

This equipment is of two types. One is a pump that injects extra air into the exhaust manifold so that fumes are burned there. Chrysler accomplished the same fume reduction by special carburetor and ignition rigging.

The other is a "blow-by" tube. Since 1963, California has required that new cars have these tubes to carry troublesome crankcase gases back into the combustion chambers.

Starting last fall, with 1966 models, the exhaust controls were made mandatory on all new cars.

The two items, blow-by tubes and exhaust controls, are supposed to eliminate 70 per cent of the two worst automobile contaminants, hydrocarbon gases and carbon monoxide. Last March the Public Health Service felt confident enough of them to promulgate the California requirements nationally for next year.

The California board is considering tightening its restrictions by nearly 50 per cent before 1970. The new restrictions would reduce permissible hydrocarbon emissions from 275 parts per million to 180, and carbon monoxide from 1.5 percent to 1 per cent.

The board is also moving toward control of another important pollutant family, oxides of nitrogen. Federal officials plan to follow close in applying such restrictions nationally.

California had hopes of developing exhaust controls for older cars, which make up 90 per cent of those on the road. This has been thwarted by both technical and legislative difficulties. The only requirement for pre-1963 models is that crankcase blow-by tubes must be put on cars when they change owners. There is no corresponding Federal requirement.

The achievement of control equipment is an oblique process. The state starts out by promulgating desired emission standards.

The standards remain theoretical until industry comes up with the equipment to match the standards. This is the situation with oxides of nitrogen, for which controls have not yet been devised.

Another problem that will present itself in all 50 states is making sure fume control equipment operates effectively, something the Federal Government can't police.

Even California has only cursory random inspection by state highway patrolmen. Comprehensive checks on fume equipment can be incorporated in regular safety inspections—New York and New Jersey have laws calling for them—but there is a problem of providing inspection stations with adequate testing devices.

California may also provide lessons for other states in the way it works out its administrative structure for pollution control.

There is now a three-way division of re-

sponsibility among the motor vehicle board, the county districts that deal with stationary pollution sources and the State Department of Health, which must work closely with the others.

Assuming that each contingent does its job perfectly, critics observe, there is no unified, statewide determination of priorities in expenditures and effort. However, Gov. Edmund G. Brown has just designated Eric Grant, the director of the motor vehicle board, as an inter-agency coordinator in a step toward unification.

Vernon MacKenzie, the recent director of the Air Pollution Division of the Public Health Service, is a soft-speaking man, inclined to understatement. But he recently remarked ominously:

"For the next decade or so every urban area is going to have to control pollution in terms that might be considered radical even in Los Angeles."

(Tomorrow: The outlook for clean air.)

Noteworthy Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the September 25, 1966, edition of the Vicksburg, Miss., Sunday Post. I commend the reading of the editorial to my colleagues because of the timely message it presents:

INVESTIGATING THE FAMOUS "GUIDELINES"

The House of Representatives will seek, through investigation, to ascertain if the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, through the "guidelines" it has imposed in the field of education, has overstepped both the letter and the spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In true bureaucratic form, the Department of Education, has formulated its own pet formulas, has withheld federal money from those areas which did not knuckle down to its arbitrary regulations, and has, in general, assumed a highly dictatorial attitude.

Under the actions of the Department, the stress has been put, not on education, but on integration. Freedom of choice is not possible, with the inference that intimidation nullifies that freedom. The spectacle of busing pupils from one area to another, is both ridiculous and tragic, for it is making pawns out of children who should have no interference with their studies. In every way, the arrogant and inflexible attitude of the Department has done more to downgrade education in the nation than anything else.

It is timely that a congressional investigation be undertaken. The Congress passed the law, and the law has certain limitations, which should be studiously followed. There has been a completely biased conception of the Civil Rights Act. Under it, discrimination was banned if based on race or color. But it did not spell out literally, or in spirit, that it should be used as a vehicle to completely integrate or to achieve "racial balance." The absence of discrimination would have the effect of bringing the educational picture into real perspective, something that forced integration and a headlong dash into racial balance would never achieve.

As has been so eloquently stated on many occasions by spokesmen for the South, the

Civil Rights Act was conceived in politics and aimed directly and exclusively at the South. In spite of the warnings of our Southern representatives, the people of other areas swallowed the plea for support on the punitive measure. But Northern and Eastern and Western citizens have come face to face with the "guidelines" and are finding out that the South is not the only area involved. Transporting pupils from one school to another, entirely out of their natural environment, has caused the people of newer areas to begin to understand the warnings which were not heeded during the debate on the measures. The opposition to the dictatorial administration of the Department of Education has become both spirited and vocal and the representatives in the Congress have begun to feel its effect.

So, let us get down to the business of conducting a searching investigation to ascertain where the power to rule has been given by the Act, or has been assumed by the bureaucrats. After all, the cause of public education is at stake, and public education means just that in every city and county in every state in the Union, and the arbitrary withholding of funds because arbitrary guidelines have not been accepted, is contrary to the American concept of government.

Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966

SPEECH OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to use this procedure to make sure that we will have an opportunity to vote on this, because as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] suggested, we ought to try the \$7,000 figure. This is very close to what the administration says they will eventually be able to run these programs, but which is way above any other similar effort training, educational, and residential which is now being carried on.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, this is certainly true with reference to the residential vocational schools which are training some drop-outs from the Job Corps, dropouts who could not be trained in the Job Corps at that extra cost, but who are now being trained in the residential vocational education schools for an average of \$2,600 per year.

Mr. Chairman, if they can do it there, the Job Corps ought to be able to do it for \$7,000.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this cannot be an unreasonable figure and, perhaps, this will in and of itself take care of some of the high salaries that are being paid to staff people and prevent the Job Corps from pirating and taking away teachers from our other school systems.

September 29, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400110002-4

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5019

1958 over 400 had been murdered by guerrillas who indeed, as Carver points out, "harped on local issues and avoided preaching Marxist doctrine." When it is remembered that there were enough "local issues" around to cause the South Vietnamese Army itself to try at least three times to murder Diem, it becomes understandable why South Viet Nam appeared to Hanoi ripe for plucking. In other words, there can be no doubt but that Hanoi, or even South Vietnamese stay-behind Communist elements, took advantage of Saigon's glaring weaknesses after 1959. But the Communists can hardly be held responsible for the incredible stupidity of the Diem regime and the somewhat surprising blindness to its faults of its American advisers. And it is equally hard to deny that there was plenty of motivation inside South Viet Nam, on the left as well as on the right, for a revolutionary explosion.

The next point which requires clarification is not whether the insurgency in South Viet Nam is abetted, directed and aided from North Viet Nam (it is to a large extent), but whether such outside controls preclude the existence of real objectives which are specifically those of the insurgents rather than of their external sponsors. Here, the recent British revelations as to the truly enormous extent of the control of the French Resistance in France by the Special Operations Executive (S.O.E.)—the 1940-46 British equivalent of the Central Intelligence Agency—shows what is meant. According to the now-published official history of S.O.E. in France, "till 1944 the British had a virtual monopoly over all of de Gaulle's means of communications with France," and the French "could not introduce a single agent or a single store" without Allied permission and help, and "anything [they] planned with marked political implications was liable to be vetoed by any of the three major Western allies." Yet, having substantiated exactly what both the Vichy French and the Nazis had said all along, i.e. that the French Resistance was nothing but an "Anglo-Saxon conspiracy" and the resisters (this writer included) nothing but foreign agents, the official history makes the key point: "All these victories by and through resistance forces in France had a common basis: overwhelming popular support."

The hard historical facts which emerge from the French Resistance and which appear to apply to the Viet Cong are (a) that in spite of overwhelming technical control by the Allies, de Gaulle succeeded in winning political and military loyalty among the diverse guerrilla forces in France, and (b) that even de Gaulle's own views and desires had to accommodate themselves to those developed by the internal resistance in its four-year fight, in which it bore the brunt of the struggle and suffered the bulk of the losses. The differences of view between Viet Cong leaders who have now been in the fight for six years (and some of them for twenty!) and the Hanoi theoreticians and conventional military commanders go in many cases far beyond normal internecine party struggles or mere tactical disagreements.

A glance at factual examples is interesting: there have been three changes of N.L.F. secretaries-general at times when Hanoi was in the throes of no purge whatsoever. There was the N.L.F. five-point manifesto of March 22, 1965, whose "jungle version" was rebroadcast later by Hanoi with 39 extensive amendments or text changes, softening some of the N.L.F. statements. There were the spontaneous reactions of N.L.F. leaders when faced with respected Western observers on neutral ground, openly explaining why they disagreed with the "narrow-minded commissars in Hanoi." And there is the fact that while

the United States and Hanoi are now officially wedded to a return to a Geneva-type conference (and, presumably, its two-year election clause), the N.L.F. has thus far left Geneva out of its program, preferring a flexible formula of eventual reunification in negotiated stages.

It is easy to dismiss those differences as being mere camouflage (after all, some people believe that the Sino-Soviet split is nothing but a grand deception foisted on the easily-fooled West) and to believe the N.L.F. is indeed nothing but "a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots," as Carver avers. But in that case, the 220,000 Viet Cong who fight side-by-side with 50,000 PAVN regulars, and who over the past three years are said to have suffered almost 100,000 dead and 182,000 wounded, fight rather well for what must be a vast mass of remote-controlled and force-drafted recruits. Otherwise, desertion would be just as easy on the Viet Cong side as it is on the ARVN side, but thus far the V.C. desertion rate simply seems to keep pace with the increase of manpower on the Communist side.

That leaves, lastly, the argument of "facelessness": the N.L.F. leaders are men of little stature in their own society; they are unknowns. But four years ago only a few Vietnamese military men knew who General Ky was, and no one thought of him even two years ago as being of presidential timber. Clandestineness is not attractive to the sort of men who are national figures: aside from Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, it takes real expertise to recall the names of European resistance leaders. In any case, N.L.F. propaganda has seen to it that its leaders should not remain anonymous: at least forty senior leaders' biographies have been published, along with their photos.⁴ Their background shows the normal social background of Vietnamese leadership in general, from medical doctors and pharmacists, to lawyers and even army officers (though the sprinkling of Montagnards and women is more typical of the likewise classic "united front" picture). And they have one remarkable common characteristic which thus far no Saigon government has been able to match: they are all from south of the seventeenth parallel.

None of the foregoing justifies Hanoi's claim that the N.L.F. should be the "sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people." But nothing justifies the opposite claim either, to the effect that without Hanoi's full support, the N.L.F. would disappear into thin air like a desert mirage. There can indeed be no quarrel with Carver's statement that "the Viet Cong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene." In that case, however, it must be treated as what it is—a political force in South Viet Nam which cannot be simply blasted off the surface of the earth with B-52 saturation raids, or told to pack up and go into exile to North Viet Nam.

There is one further consideration which argues against the likelihood of Hanoi being able (assuming it were willing, and it does not seem to be) to turn off the southern guerrilla movement like a water tap: Hanoi has, since March 1946, made four separate deals with the West at the expense of the South Vietnamese. The French-Vietnamese accords of March 6, 1946, provided for a Vietnamese "free state with its own government, armed forces and foreign relations" but left South Viet Nam proper (i.e., Cochinchina) under French control and, as it turned out, severe anti-Viet Minh repression. The French-Vietnamese *modus vivendi* signed by Ho Chi Minh in Paris, September 14, 1946, further confirmed this seeming "abandonment" of the South. In the Geneva Accords

of July 1954, it was South Viet Nam which was left to the tender mercies of the Diem régime for at least two years, and we have Nguyen Huu Tho's own word in an interview with Wilfred Burchett to the effect that "there were mixed feelings about the two-years' delay over reunification." And when neither Hanoi nor Peking (nor the Soviet Union) made strong representations against dropping elections in 1956, it must have become obvious to even the most obtuse pro-Hanoi elements south of the seventeenth parallel that the North Vietnamese Communists are somewhat unreliable allies.

The Inner City School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in four different places in today's Record I am inserting an account of a Detroit Free Press reporter's experiences, as an English teacher, in a Detroit inner city school, along with his recommendations. In my judgment, Mr. Jim Treloar brings sensitive insight to bear on one of America's great problems.

One of the articles follows:

THE INNER CITY CLASSROOM—A REPORTER'S EDUCATION

(By Jim Treloar)

Miss Kenneth Schaal, the head of the English department, led the way downstairs to Room 127, the click of her heels running two steps ahead in the pre-school quiet.

The room I was to teach in at Jefferson Intermediate School is on the first floor, next to the stairwell. She opened the door and turned on the lights.

There was a wad of gum stuck on the blackboard. In one corner, paint flaked off the ceiling. Later, students would sit very still and watch the pieces drift down and land on their shoulders and in their hair, artificial dandruff.

Last year's paper and chalk scented the air. The only splash of color came from sheets of yellow paper stapled across the top of the blackboard, the edges curling with age.

I don't know how old the desks were, but there must have been two generations of initials etched into the unvarnished tops. Each desk had a hole for an inkwell, and those were going out of date when I was in school.

There's a dark little courtyard just outside the window, with iron gratings everywhere. In the middle sat a cement something where trash was thrown.

Miss Schaal saw me looking out the window. "We had lovely curtains to cover the window, but the last teacher in this room took them. She only lasted five months."

It had been one of those pencil-sharp, eraser-clean fall days when I entered the Detroit Public Schools' placement office on Woodward Avenue and met Mrs. Julie Strawn.

I asked her for a job teaching American History in high school, because that's where my interest and competence lay. History is my graduate major, and my teaching experience had been in a country high school.

What I got was a job teaching English and social studies in junior high school. I told Mrs. Strawn that I had only the most minimum class time for an undergraduate minor in English, and that I hadn't opened the book since the 6th

⁴ M.R.D. Foot, "S.O.E. in France," London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966, p. xix, 33, and 442-443, *passim*.

⁴ Commission for Foreign Relations of the National Liberation Movement, a.d. [1963], 44.

A5020

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 29, 1966

Briskly, Mrs. Strawn explained: "We require our high school teachers to have a master's degree." I was two or three classes short of my master's, so I settled for a job in which I didn't feel competent.

(The fact is that only 66.28 percent of Detroit's high school teachers have master's degrees.)

In college, you study to be either a "secondary" or an "elementary" teacher. Junior high schools are lumped with high schools and called "secondary."

But in a school like Jefferson, elementary teaching skills are needed. You don't toss American literature at children who still don't know how to read. I'd never taken a course in elementary education and had no idea how to teach a child to read.

The same sort of thing happens to other teachers. One, who earned a Phi Beta Kappa key while majoring in biology, applied for a junior high science position.

"No," she was told. "You haven't had physics."

She was offered a job teaching mathematics instead.

"But I haven't had a math course since high school!" she protested. The placement office explained that they badly needed math teachers. A science opening was "discovered" only when the teacher refused to take any other job.

Early next morning, I arrived at Jefferson School, built in 1922 at the corner of Selden and Fourth on Detroit's near West Side, and presented myself to Miss Schaal, my department head.

I found her in a cramped little office, blowing dust off an armful of books. She sized me up in one quick glance and found me wanting.

Miss Schaal is pushing retirement. Her hair which looks like bleached straw, was already disheveled by work, and it wasn't 8:30 yet.

Her face is dried by years of chalk dust, but those blue eyes crackled. I thought: "Here's a gal who knows how to teach." My first impression was just as accurate as hers.

After she introduced me to Room 127, I asked her if the students already had their textbooks.

"The seventh and eighth graders don't get textbooks," she said.

"When I get them to you, the books are to be kept in the room. You pass them out when you need them, and you collect them at the end of the hour. If the children took books home, we'd never get them back."

"The ninth graders will get English texts, but they'll have to sign out for them. We try to push homework on the ninth graders, but don't bank on it ever getting done."

"And watch that they don't write in the books!" She grabbed a book at random, opened the cover and triumphantly displayed the most common two-word obscenity in the English language.

"If the children start complaining about the condition of the books, just take them away," she said. "One class complained about how badly marked up their spellers were last year, so we just took them away."

"You've got to be careful. These kids can demonstrate. You probably heard what happened at Northern High school last year. Who do these kids think mark the books up anyhow, huh?"

The textbooks—for classroom use only—kept dribbling in all the time I was at Jefferson.

It was a week before the ninth graders got their English texts. When I left at the end of seven days, there were still no literature books.

I found that I'd have to share the seventh grade geography and eighth grade history books with the teachers.

But the children at Jefferson lack even more basic than textbooks.

When I inspected the boys' lavatory, there was no soap, no towels—not even toilet paper.

Billy Stanhouse, the teacher across the hall, told me: "If we supplied the lavatories, they'd rip the fixtures off the walls and throw the paper all around."

I didn't see any teacher's copies of the text books I'd be using and asked Mrs. Schaal where they were.

"We expect our teachers to be able to handle the children for two or three days without having to use texts," she said.

When I persisted, she told me: "If we gave them out right away, some teachers would take them home and never come back. Some of our teachers don't last very long. Besides, I have a full schedule of classes myself, and I don't have time to cart books around!"

She careened out the door muttering something over her shoulder.

But, she was back in five minutes with my copies of the texts. She's just as tough with her teachers as she is with her students; but she always came through for me. I suspect she never disappointed her students either.

When that was straightened out, Miss Schaal began ticking off the things I'd be responsible for.

"Each teacher is allowed only \$5 for classroom supplies each year," she said. "But if you're not here in May to fill out the forms for the next year, you're just out of luck."

"Keep your blackboards clean. The janitors don't have time to wash them. We'll give you a basin, but you'll have to buy your own sponge. Don't get a plastic one."

"If you need mimeograph paper, there's some in the office. We're not supposed to give you any, but you can use what's there. After that's gone, you'll have to buy your own."

"You'll need a lesson-plan book. You can buy one at the book store."

The \$27.50 a day I was getting for this job began to shrink. The two years I'd taught at Fowlerville Community Schools, everything had been supplied; the janitors kept the rooms spotless; and if you wanted something mimeographed you whistled for an office girl. Teachers were supposed to concentrate on teaching.

But within a week a sponge appeared, and a day later I found a lesson-plan book in my locker. I don't know where she rustled up the sponge, but I knew Miss Schaal had paid for the book herself.

I also found out about those curtains that had been swiped from my room. Miss Schaal made them last year from material she bought. Jefferson School has no money for such niceties.

Jefferson's teachers object to many of the textbooks they use.

The books speak in terms the inner city child doesn't understand. The street scenes described in their English books aren't what they see. The problems they hear about in social studies aren't the social problems that are important to them.

Sally Johnson, who teaches history and has a way of putting things, announced at lunch one day: "The stuff I have to give these kids is just so much garp!"

Miss Schaal told me there were special materials written for the inner city youngsters, but that she hadn't the money to buy them.

"I was supposed to have \$1,000 for extra materials this year," she said, "but the social studies people overspent their budget."

"When the school board auditors caught it, they took away my \$1,000 to help balance the books, and that was the end of that."

I took another look at the first letter the school board wrote me when I applied for this job.

In part it read: "Those of us who have years have developed a deep loyalty to the system who support us so well."

Progress in the Other War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our preoccupation with the military effort should not divert our interest from what we know as "the other war" in South Vietnam.

President Johnson has made public a report on what is being done to improve the life of the people in the villages and hamlets of that testing ground of freedom.

I believe it warrants study by all of us who recognize the importance to mankind of the conflict in South Vietnam.

Parts of the report by Robert W. Komer of the President's staff are summed up by the Washington Post in an editorial which discusses the progress made in education, transportation, housing, health and everyday living for the South Vietnamese.

The Post comments that the constructive task of pacification is an essential counterpart of our military endeavor. It states that these civil programs go nicely with the new hopes justified by the South Vietnamese elections.

The record to date, declares the Post, is one in which the United States can take satisfaction before the world.

The complete editorial is as follows:

THE OTHER WAR

Since 1957 more than 18,000 South Vietnamese civilian officials—village headmen, schoolteachers, technicians—have been murdered or kidnaped by the Communists. In the week of Sept. 4-10 this year, more than four times as many South Vietnamese as Americans were killed by enemy action. These figures ought to be understood more widely in Europe. At a time when our pre-occupations are understandably with American casualties and military efforts, they give extra emphasis to a report just submitted to the President on "the other war" in Vietnam—the efforts to assist the South Vietnamese civilian society that has been so cruelly ravaged.

In this report Special Assistant Robert W. Komer relates an impressive chronicle of what is being done to build schoolrooms, dispensaries and roads, to house refugees, to improve and expand agricultural production, to broaden the industrial base and provide more electric power, to increase port facilities, to check inflation through monetary reform and American imports. Some 6400 hamlet school classrooms have been built, for example, 1600 of them in 1966 alone. Some 280,000 refugees were resettled and 460,000 given temporary shelter within the last year.

No less significant are the accomplishments in internal security, although the figures are less dramatic. It often has been assumed, erroneously, that most of the people of South Vietnam are under Vietcong domination. In point of fact, by August 31 of this year some 55 per cent of the population was in "secure" areas. Another 21 per cent lived in areas that fluctuated between South Vietnamese and Vietcong control, while only 24 per cent were in parts of the country dominated by the Vietcong. In the year ending June 30 nearly 1000 additional hamlets had been made secure, and in 1966

23390

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 29, 1966

two-and-a-half hours instead of the present six. A Monte Carlo gambler could fly to Las Vegas to try his luck in a different setting in three hours instead of seven.

Along the way the sonic boom would leave a trail of broken windows, awakened and crying babies and falling plaster that Wisconsin "survivors" of the B-58 supersonic bomber runs of a few years ago can vividly recall.

At that time my office was deluged with complaints. Wisconsinites put up with this resounding nuisance out of patriotism. But you could hardly be expected to do the same for the pleasure-loving jet-set.

SYMINGTON JOINS FIGHT

The unsolved technical problems are so great and so expensive to solve that Senator STUART SYMINGTON (D.-Mo.), a former Secretary of the Air Force and a leading champion of American aviation, helped me lead the fight for my amendment before the Senate.

The supersonic transport not only would have no military value but would be used strictly for private commercial purposes.

For the federal government to provide this kind of massive subsidy to a private industry is virtually unprecedented.

WHY FORCE ADDITIONAL HALF BILLION ON DEFENSE?

I also fought and voted to cut defense appropriations back by half a billion dollars to the level requested by the President and the Defense Department.

YOUR COST OF LIVING AT STAKE

Every one of these amendments was zeroed in to cut back government spending in the most inflationary part of the economy.

American business has sharply increased its spending for plant and equipment, breaking all records. Competitive government spending in this area where manpower and materials are especially in short supply is sure to drive prices up.

And because the government with its deficit has to borrow money to pay for these additional expenditures, spending also drives interest rates up as government demand for money bids up the price of money; i.e., interest.

Our fight helped to make Senators more conscious of the fact that government spending drives up your cost of living.

We aren't giving up. We intend to carry on this fight!

SELECTION OF STEPHEN N. SHULMAN LAUDED

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Stephen N. Shulman as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In my judgment, the President selected one of the Government's most capable young executives to serve in this key position. It will be my pleasure to work closely with him, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, before which subcommittee come legislative matters dealing with equal employment opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shulman's extensive scholastic, business, legal, and Government service accomplishments—which in my judgment indicate that the Commission, under his direction, should have a bright future—may be printed in the Record, in the form of a biographical sketch.

There being no objection, the bio-

graphical sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF STEPHEN N. SHULMAN, CHAIRMAN, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Shulman received an A.B. degree from Harvard University in 1964. He then did industrial and labor relations work for Bendix Aviation Corporation, first at the Friez Instrument Division in Towson, Maryland, and later at the Utica Division in Utica, New York.

He received an LL.B. degree, *cum laude*, from Yale University in 1958. At Yale, he was Editor-in-Chief of the Yale Law Journal and a member of the Order of the Coif honorary society.

Shulman was Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Harlan, Supreme Court of the United States, for the October Term, 1958.

He was associated with the law firm of Covington & Burling in the District of Columbia until May 1960, when he became Assistant United States Attorney for the District.

In February 1961, Shulman was appointed Executive Assistant to the Secretary of Labor by then Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg. While in that post, he served for a time as Acting Executive Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. In November 1962, he was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of Civilian Personnel and Industrial Relations by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. In August 1964, Secretary McNamara added Civil Rights to Shulman's responsibilities.

On September 1, 1965, Shulman took office as General Counsel of the Air Force. He has served, in 1959, as Visiting Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Michigan and, in 1965, as Visiting Professor of Management at the University of Oklahoma. In May 1966, Shulman was awarded the William A. Jump Memorial Foundation Award for exemplary service in public administration in the Departments of Labor and Defense. He subsequently became a member of the Board of Trustees of the Foundation.

On August 30, 1966, President Johnson nominated Shulman as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

A native of New Haven, Connecticut, Shulman is 33 years old, and is married to the former Sandra P. Still, also of New Haven. They have three children: Harry, age eight; Dean Jeffrey, age five; and John David, age three.

THE ELECTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of undue optimism, in my judgment, over the long-range results of the recent election in Vietnam.

I do not deny that the turnout at the election was highly gratifying, nor do I deny that a group of quite able Vietnamese citizens appear to have been selected to draft a new constitution for that unhappy country. But I suspect that many of the paeans of praise and joy and optimism which have been forthcoming from commentators and others are quite unjustified, in that they go much too far in their interpretation of what this election means.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Clayton Fritchey entitled "Why the Joy Over Viet Election?" may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the Washington (D.C.), Evening Star, Sept. 19, 1966]

WHY THE JOY OVER VIET ELECTION?
(By Clayton Fritchey)

The post-election jag in South Viet Nam goes on unabated, and the intoxication of Washington officialdom almost equals that of the Saigon generals, who are described as "almost delirious with joy."

Premier Ky and the other leaders of the military dictatorship are hailing the election as a "triumph for democracy," a "smashing victory" for the government, and a testimonial to the ruling junta.

The President of the U.S. has added his own beaming benediction: "The large turnout," he said, "is to me a vote of confidence." Confidence in what?

If the American people swallow the new Ky-Johnson line, they will again end up disappointed and disillusioned, just as they have in the past when the truth ultimately deflated previous propaganda fantasies.

It is better to face up to the truth at once, and the truth is that the Viet Nam election (if it can honestly be called that) is by no stretch of the imagination a testimonial to Gen. Ky's military government.

No one yet knows what the election results really mean, or even pretend, so Ky and his U.S. supporters simply proclaim that the mere size of the turnout (also in dispute) is in itself an endorsement of the government.

Yet the one, indisputable fact seems to be that if the vote is a testimonial to anything at all, it is to the people's deep desire to have an elected, civilian government, and not a self-imposed military one, such as Ky presently heads up.

Just how that constitutes a ringing affirmation of the Ky junta is something that baffles disinterested observers, most of whom see the election as a strong expression of popular will for replacing the generals with a constitutional, representative government.

If that is so, why are the generals so elated? They are jubilant because they think they have succeeded (temporarily at least) in acquiring the protective coloring of a democratic election, without running any risks to their own future. They think they have fixed it so that they are safe no matter what happens. And they are probably right in this estimate.

As everyone knows, the only reason the elections were held in the first place is that the Buddhists forced Ky to call them. Last spring, it took weeks of demonstrations, violence, and fiery immolations to exact an electoral promise from the junta. The Buddhists have never been pro-Communist or pro-Viet Cong. They simply fought for elections and representative government until the militarists grudgingly gave in.

No doubt the hopes of many unsophisticated Vietnamese, especially in the provinces, have been momentarily raised by the joy of just casting a ballot; and no doubt many Americans would like to believe Premier Ky's statement that the election means "a brighter, more beautiful future" for his nation.

The only fly in this unctuous ointment, is that in the little more than 10 years of South Viet Nam's history there have been a dozen military governments, and none of these regimes, including Ky's, has yet been able to find a place for the people in the country's "beautiful future."

COST OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion lately about how much the war in Vietnam is costing on a monthly basis. The other day, Secretary Fowler indicated that he

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23389

If they are going to permit the kind of international expansion they need and the liquidity that they must have, they will see the need to get together and negotiate.

None of us likes the kind of painful policies that are necessary in the judgment of many people to get our payments in balance.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the reason why Secretary Fowler has not been making the kind of progress that he wants to make.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I point out that, in my judgment, the balance-of-payments situation is getting worse and not better.

The annual rate of the deficit during the second quarter was around \$1.6 billion. All early indications are that the third quarter will be much worse.

We have no feasible method left by which to bring our balance of payments in balance except two, one of which I would strenuously object to. One involves cutting back on our domestic prosperity by rigorous methods of austerity accompanied by restrictions on international trade. The other involves stopping the war in Vietnam and bringing the troops home from Europe. If we could eliminate those costs, we would go two-thirds of the way toward eliminating our balance-of-payments difficulty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am afraid that I left the situation dangling when I implied that the only answer is to correct our balance-of-payments difficulty.

I do think that the Senator from New York brings in a very wholesome thought when he implies that we should not be so paralyzed and overwhelmingly concerned about the loss of gold.

The fact is that if we did refuse to buy gold at \$35 an ounce, the value of gold, in my judgment, would diminish quite rapidly. That is very controversial and the economists do not all agree on the matter. We need much greater discussion on this.

We do not have to make a judgment that we would otherwise not make with regard to military policy, foreign policy, and so forth in order to solve this very difficult world monetary situation.

Mr. JAVITS. The essential difference between the Senator and myself is not a critical matter. It is not a matter of criticizing Secretary Fowler. He is probably following the instructions of the administration.

Mr. CLARK. Reluctantly.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct, and he is doing so, in my judgment, to the best of his ability. I never criticize any President or Cabinet officer for doing his best.

In the famous TRX investigation, although I disagreed with the administration, I was its best defender.

I do not want to be in a position of criticizing Secretary Fowler, for whom I have a wholesome affection.

We must take this matter out of the private room in which it is being considered. We must expose it to the light of day. This is a matter of urgency.

No. 165—2

It is like the old story of the war being too important to entrust to generals.

That is why I urge an international monetary conference.

Mr. CLARK. I do not think the investigation is being conducted in a smoke-filled room. All we would have to do to find out would be to go to the Sheraton Park Hotel and see the matter discussed in the presence of the representatives of the press from a hundred countries. I think this discussion has been on the top of the table.

That is why I cannot candidly agree with the suggestions of the Senator from New York, that, by the mechanics of calling an international monetary conference, we would be doing much more than is being done now.

Nobody wants to get off the gold exchange standard any quicker than I do. It is obsolete and outmoded. There is not enough gold being produced in our country, South Africa, Russia, or elsewhere to meet the needs.

As in the depression in the early thirties, we will have to abandon the gold exchange standard. I do not think the time is far away when we will have to abandon the gold exchange standard. It may well be that the suggestion of the Senator from New York that we refuse to buy gold is one step in the right direction.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to cover one more point to make the matter clear in the Record.

Mr. CLARK. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Interestingly enough, our debates are getting reported, although it may be a little delayed. However, people do digest them.

I have noticed that in respect to a number of recent matters.

We are pinned on a dilemma. If we reduce our balance of payments by the drastic method we have discussed, then we will very materially hurt our security and the security of the world. If we fail to reduce the balance of payments, then the fellows who are going to try to drive us into an international crisis in an effort to balance our accounts will be hurt the most, and they know this.

We must unilaterally move with our enormous financial and economic power to help ourselves and seek to avoid the inevitability of the Greek tragedy which is driving us toward an international balance-of-payments crisis.

The ways in which we can help ourselves unilaterally are the ways by which we have to explore the situation.

The unacceptable ways are the elimination of American tourism and the bringing back of our troops.

The acceptable way is to utilize the power of the dollar for its world effect. We should obtain freeze agreements with everybody else in the world with respect to calling on gold and leave only the French to call on it. We would thus imperil them with the sterilization of the gold they have so all they could do with such gold would be to make gold teeth out of it.

That is a tough method to pursue, but

it is what we may have to do. That is the issue that I raise.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, seeing no one else in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not in excess of 10 minutes for the purpose of speaking on other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR PROXMIRE'S
NEWSLETTER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in September, last month, our able colleague, Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, issued a newsletter under the heading "Keep Down Prices You Pay by Cutting Government Spending." I find myself in complete accord with a large number of the suggestions made by the Senator in that newsletter, particularly his recommendations dealing with cutting out the waste in space, the problem of the jet-set giveaway—in other words, the supersonic transport—and the forcing of an additional half billion dollars, which the administration does not want, on the Defense Department.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Senator's newsletter may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KEEP DOWN PRICES YOU PAY BY CUTTING
GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Members of Congress—especially Senators—without regard to party must take a heavy share of the blame for the rise in your cost of living.

Government spending does push up the prices you pay and no one can deny it. The government is competing for what you and I buy and driving up prices in the process.

CUT SPACE WASTE

This is exactly why I introduced amendments to cut half a billion dollars of highly inflationary frills out of the space program last month. I also fought to cut \$200 million Congress proposes to spend during this fiscal year for the supersonic transport.

The amendment to slash the space program would have reduced funds by 10%. It would have left enough to carry out the moon probe but forced space officials to do what every businessman and housewife has to do: stop the spending you don't really need.

JET-SET GIVEAWAY

As for the supersonic transport, the amendment would have prevented the \$40 million the Federal Aviation Agency will start to pour each and every month into building a prototype super-speed plane beginning next February.

Now if there's anything this country doesn't need, it's this giveaway to the jet-set. This plane will cost you as a taxpayer three billion dollars before it's completed, and it may never fly. Defense authorities, including Secretary McNamara, have indicated that the plane will have no military value at all.

NEW YORK TO PARIS IN TWO AND A HALF HOURS

If it does fly, it could carry a playboy and his girl from New York to Paris in about

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23391

thought the cost was about \$1.5 billion a month. An analysis of his figures shows that he eliminates a number of items which I believe most objective individuals would agree should be included in that cost.

During a colloquy in which I engaged with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], during consideration of the defense appropriations bill, he gave me information which indicated that in his judgment—and in the judgment of Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services—the monthly cost was not less than \$2 billion a month.

In the Washington Post, on September 23, the cost of the war in Vietnam was stated by Marquis Childs, a well-known and very reliable commentator, as being \$2.7 billion a month. He states:

Rather than a random figure picked out of the air, this is a careful calculation accepted at the highest level of Government concerned with taxes and debt and the storm cloud of threatened inflation hovering over the economy.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Childs' column may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1966]

THE COST OF WAR AND THE ECONOMY
(By Marquis Childs)

The war in Vietnam is now costing \$2.7 billion a month. Rather than a random figure picked out of the air, this is a careful calculation accepted at the highest level of Government concerned with taxes and debt and the storm cloud of threatened inflation hovering over the economy.

What is more, it is believed that President Johnson is now convinced he cannot wait until January to ask Congress for an increase in personal and corporate income taxes. Nor will Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara delay until after the first of the year his long-anticipated request for the added money to finance the war. This will be in the range of \$11 to \$14 billion.

These stark facts of life cannot be concealed by rhetoric. For the past six months the President, as so many of his predecessors before him in troubled times, has been imprisoned on the rack between the pulls of policy and politics. He has felt he had to postpone the bitter medicine, and one consequence is an aura of mistrust obscuring that brief passage on Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House.

Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee in the House called some time ago for a forthright statement of what the war was costing, how much economy could be expected in domestic programs and where this came out in relation to inflation and a tax increase. He found the reply sent by the Treasury vague and ambiguous.

With MILLS feeling he had been given a runaround, this did not improve the atmosphere.

McNamara's tactic in muffling the mounting cost of the war is also the source of widespread grumbling. In the current budget Vietnam spending is based on the assumption the war will begin to phase out in June and the American commitment curtailed. The reason, the Secretary explains, is to prevent the services from overspending. He cites the waste of some \$20 billion in materiel at the end of the Korean War as a horrible example of what he means to avoid.

But the rapid escalation in the cost of the war has created a growing sense of the un-

reality of the Administration's fiscal stance. During 1966 the cost has gone from an estimated \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion to the current \$2.7 billion a month. With virtually none of this contained in the budget the result is a never-never land in which incalculable forces threaten stability.

For most of us the money supply and interest rates are arcane matters as remote as the question of whether there is life on Mars. But what has been happening in recent months bring it down to the pinch of daily life, as anyone discovers traveling around the country. A loan for a year in college is hard to come by. The interest rate has skyrocketed on mortgages on old and new dwellings and the money is not there. The real estate market is slowing to a jog trot.

Whether this is the way to cure inflation is, to say the least, questionable, as the President has been told by those arguing for the simple method of a tax increase. The debate has been going on since last December when the Federal Reserve Board raised the re-discount rate despite the fervent plea of the President. Don't apply the brake on the money supply, the President argued, until you see our budget for next year.

As a sop to the chorus demanding action to damp down the rise in prices and interest rates, the President called for canceling the 7 percent investment credit. That undoubtedly fed the boom. The effect of cancellation will, however, hardly be felt before six months or more have passed. With the crucial date of Nov. 8 in the offing it was a gesture calculated to offend the minimum number of voters who could in any event be counted as already alienated from the Great Society.

When he signed the interest rate bill the President did not disclose what his aides describe as a kind of pact of peace with the Federal Reserve Board. The Fed, using the authority under the measure, will impose a ceiling on long-term certificates of deposit, dropping the interest rate perhaps half of one percent from its present level.

Effective as this will be, in a limited sense, it is not, in the view of those profoundly concerned with the direction of the economy, a substitute for a tax increase to soak up surplus money. Nor, sad as it must seem to the President, are his appeals for voluntary cooperation from the bankers, trade unions, industry any more effective in throttling down the racing engine of prosperity.

INFORMATION SERVICES CENTER
OPENED BY SMITH KLINE &
FRENCH LABORATORIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I was happy, indeed, to receive a copy of a release issued by Smith Kline & French Laboratories, a respected and very prosperous drug company, which has its main office at 1500 Spring Garden Street in Philadelphia.

This release indicates that the company, at its own expense, is setting up an office where people in the Spring Garden area, which is part of our north central Philadelphia poverty area, can find out where they can get help when they need it. This office has already been officially opened, and I believe it to be the first service of its kind to be operated by a business concern.

I want to congratulate the company and all its executives, particularly F. Markoe Rivinus, its president, for this splendid action in the public service.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the press release may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press re-

lease was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An office where people in the Spring Garden area can find out where they can get help when they need it will be opened officially today (September 23) at 1720 Mount Vernon Street.

It will be known as the Information Services Center and will be managed and supported by Smith Kline & French Laboratories, the pharmaceutical firm located nearby at 1500 Spring Garden Street.

It will be the first service of its kind to be operated by a business firm.

F. Markoe Rivinus, Smith Kline & French President, said the center was established to meet a serious need in the area.

"The center will be a bridge between the people of the Spring Garden neighborhood and government and social services. Our experience in this neighborhood has shown that the people do not know what services are available and do not know how to avail themselves of the services. Our purpose is to help fill this gap."

The center principally will serve the area bounded by Spring Garden Street, Broad Street, Fairmount Avenue and Twenty-first Street. The company estimates the area has a population of about 24,000.

The center has a staff of two and a secretary-receptionist. It will be open from 8:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Staff members are Carver A. Portlock and Tom Perry. Portlock formerly was Alumni Director of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida. Perry, who speaks Spanish, formerly was with the Human Relations Commission here. Ana Vazquez is the secretary-receptionist.

The center has been operating unofficially since April at the Mount Vernon Street address, which formerly was a church building. Portlock joined Smith Kline & French shortly afterward. Through the assistance of Mayor James H. J. Tate's office he received an orientation to the services available in the city government.

Among the problems handled by the center since April were finding jobs for adults and teen-agers; sending people to agencies which can supply food and clothing; trying to remedy housing problems, including a large number of requests for better housing; mediating debt problems; finding interpreters; giving advice on how to apply for such jobs as police officer and practical nurse; helping to get children enrolled in day camps, and so on.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that this action by this fine, public-spirited firm, Smith Kline & French, may be emulated by many others of our great industrial corporations, not only in Pennsylvania, but also across the Nation.

UN
AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S VIET-
NAM PEACE OFFENSIVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn now to the subject of Ambassador Goldberg's address at the United Nations on Thursday, September 22, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that address may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1966]
TEXT OF GOLDBERG'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM,
AFRICA, AND SPACE

(By Arthur J. Goldberg, Chief U.S. Delegate)
UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Sept. 22.—As the General Assembly convenes in this 21st year of the United Nations, we of the United

23392

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 29, 1966

States are aware, as indeed every delegation must be, of the great responsibilities which all of us share who work in this world organization for peace.

No one, I am sure, feels these responsibilities more keenly than our Secretary General, U Thant. In the past five years he has filled with distinction and effectiveness what is perhaps the most difficult office in the world. We know how much selfless dedication and energy have been exacted from him on behalf of the world community. We can well understand how the burdens of his office led him to his decision not to offer himself for a second term as Secretary General.

But the United Nations needs him. It needs him as a person. It needs him as a Secretary General who conceives his office in the full spirit of the Charter as an important organ of the United Nations, endowed with the authority to act with initiative and effectiveness. The members, in all their diversity and even discord, are united in their confidence in him. His departure at this crucial time in world affairs, and in the life of the United Nations, would be a serious loss both to the organization itself and to the cause of peace among nations. We reiterate our earnest hope that he will heed the unanimous wishes of the membership and permit his tenure of office to be extended. His affirmative decision on this question would give us all new courage to deal with the many great problems on our agenda.

The peoples of the world, Mr. President, expect the United Nations to resolve these problems. With all their troubles and aspirations they put great faith in this organization. They look to us not for pious words but for solid results—agreements reached, wars ended or prevented, treaties written, cooperative programs launched—results that will bring humanity a few steps, but giant steps, closer to the purposes of the Charter which are our common commitment.

"MORE USEFUL CONTRIBUTION"

Realizing this, the United States has considered what it could say in this general debate which would improve the prospects for such fruitful results in the present session. We concluded that, rather than attempt to review the many questions to which we attach importance, we could make a more useful contribution by concentrating on the serious dangers to peace now existing in Asia—particularly the war in Vietnam—and by treating this subject in a constructive and positive way.

The conflict in Vietnam is first of all an Asian issue, whose tragedy and suffering fall most heavily on the peoples directly involved. But its repercussions are worldwide. It diverts much of the energies of many nations, my own included, from urgent and constructive endeavors. It is, as the Secretary General said in his statement on September 1, "a source of grave concern and is bound to be a source of even greater anxiety, not only to the parties directly involved and to the major powers but also to other members of the organization." My Government remains determined to exercise every restraint to limit the war and to exert every effort to bring the conflict to the earliest possible end.

The essential facts of the Vietnam conflict can be stated briefly. Vietnam today remains divided along the demarcation line agreed upon in Geneva in 1954. To the north and south of that line are North Vietnam and South Vietnam. Provisional though they may be, pending a decision on the peaceful reunification of Vietnam by the process of self-determination, they are nonetheless political realities in the international community.

The Geneva accord which established the demarcation line is so thorough in its prohibition of the use of force that it forbids military interference of any sort by one side in the affairs of the other; it even forbids civilians to cross the demilitarized zone. In 1962 military infiltration through Laos was

also forbidden. Yet, despite these provisions, South Vietnam is under an attack, already several years old, by forces directed and supplied from the North, and reinforced by regular units—currently some 17 identified regiments—of the North Vietnamese Army. The manifest purpose of this attack is to force upon the people of South Vietnam a system which they have not chosen by any peaceful process.

Let it be noted that this action by North Vietnam contravenes not only the United Nations Charter but also the terms of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), adopted unanimously only last December and entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty."

That resolution declares, among other things, that "no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state." It further declares that "no state shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed toward the violent overthrow of another state, or interfere in civil strife in another state." It would be hard to write a more concise description of what North Vietnam is doing, and has been doing for years, in South Vietnam.

Certainly the prohibition of the use of force and subversion—both by this resolution and by the Charter itself—must apply with full vigor to international demarcation lines that have been established by solemn international agreements. This is true not only in Vietnam but in all the divided States, where the recourse to force between the divided parts can have far-reaching consequences. Furthermore solemn international agreements, specifically the Geneva accords, explicitly prohibit recourse to force as a means of reunifying that country.

Mr. President, it is because of the attempt to upset by violence the situation in Vietnam, and its far-reaching implications elsewhere, that the United States and other countries have responded to appeals from South Vietnam for military assistance.

Our aims in giving this assistance are strictly limited.

We are not engaged in a "holy war" against Communism.

We do not seek to establish an American empire or a "sphere of influence" in Asia.

We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances, no permanent American "presence" of any kind in South Vietnam.

We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Vietnam.

We do not seek the overthrow of the Government of North Vietnam.

We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China nor to threaten any of its legitimate interests.

POLITICAL SOLUTION SOUGHT

We do not ask of North Vietnam an unconditional surrender or indeed the surrender of anything that belongs to it; nor do we seek to exclude any segment of the South Vietnamese people from peaceful participation in their country's future.

Let me say affirmatively and succinctly what our aims are.

We want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict. By the same token, we reject the idea that North Vietnam has a right to impose a military solution.

We seek to assure for the people of South Vietnam the same right of self-determination—to decide their own political destiny, free of force—that the United Nations Charter affirms for all.

And we believe that reunification of Vietnam should be decided upon through a free choice by the peoples of both the North and South without outside interference, the re-

sults of which choice we are fully prepared to support.

These, then, are our affirmative aims. We are well aware of the stated position of Hanoi on these issues. But no differences can be resolved without contact, discussions or negotiations. For our part, we have long been and remain today ready to negotiate without any prior conditions.

We are prepared to discuss Hanoi's four points together with any points which other parties may wish to raise. We are ready to negotiate a settlement based on a strict observance of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements, which observance was called for in the communiqué of the recent meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries in Bucharest. And we will support a reconvening of the Geneva conference, or an Asian conference, or any other generally acceptable forum.

At the same time we have also soberly considered whether the lack of agreement on peace aims has been the sole barrier to the beginning of negotiations. We are aware that some perceive other obstacles, and I wish to make three proposals with respect to them:

First, it is said that one obstacle is the United States bombing of North Vietnam. Let it be recalled that there was no bombing of North Vietnam for five years during which there was steadily increasing infiltration from North Vietnam; during which there were no United States combat forces in Vietnam; and during which strenuous efforts were being made to achieve a peaceful settlement. And let it further be recalled that twice before we have suspended our bombing, once for 37 days, without any reciprocal act of de-escalation from the other side, and without any sign from them of a willingness to negotiate.

U.S. OFFERS "FIRST STEP"

Nevertheless, let me say that, in this matter, the United States is willing once again to take the first step. We are prepared to order a cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam—the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side. We therefore urge before this Assembly that the Government in Hanoi be asked the following question, to which we would be prepared to receive either a private or a public response:

Would it in the interest of peace, and in response to a prior cessation by the United States of the bombing in North Vietnam, take corresponding and timely steps to reduce or bring to an end its own military activities against South Vietnam?

Another obstacle is said to be North Vietnam's conviction or fear that the United States intends to establish a permanent military presence in Vietnam. There is no basis for such a fear. The United States stands ready to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs so that peace can be restored in South Vietnam, and favors international machinery—either of the United Nations or other machinery—to insure effective supervision of the withdrawal. We therefore urge that Hanoi be asked the following question also:

Would North Vietnam be willing to agree to a time schedule for supervised, phased withdrawal from South Vietnam of all external forces—those of North Vietnam as well as those from the United States and other countries aiding South Vietnam?

A further obstacle is said to be disagreement over the place of the Vietcong in the negotiations. Some argue that, regardless of different views on who controls the Vietcong, it is a combatant force and, as such, should take part in the negotiations.

Some time ago our view on this matter was stated by President Johnson, who made clear that, as far as we are concerned, this question would not be "an insurmountable problem." We therefore invite the authorities in

September 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23393

Hanoi to consider whether this obstacle to negotiation may not be more imaginary than real.

Mr. President, we offer these proposals in the interest of peace in Southeast Asia. There may be other proposals. We have not been and are not now inflexible in our position. But we do believe that, whatever approach finally succeeds, it will not be one which simply decries what is happening in Vietnam and appeals to one side to stop while encouraging the other. Such a position can only further delay the peace we all desire and fervently hope for. The only workable formula for a settlement will be one which is just to the basic interests of all who are involved.

In this spirit we welcome discussion of this question either in the Security Council, where the United States itself has raised the matter, or here in the General Assembly, and we are fully prepared to take part in any such discussion. We earnestly solicit the further initiative of any organ, including the Secretary General, or any member of the United Nations whose influence can help in this cause. Every member has a responsibility to exert its power and influence for peace; and the greater its power and influence, the greater is this responsibility.

Now I turn to another problem, related in part to the first; the problem of how to foster a constructive relationship between the mainland of China, with its 700 million people, and the outside world. The misdirection of so much of the energies of this vast, industrious and gifted people into xenophobic displays, such as the extraordinary, difficult to understand and alarming activities of the Red Guards; and the official policy and doctrine of promoting revolution and subversion throughout the world—these are among the most disturbing phenomena of our age. Surely, among the essentials of peace in Asia are "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies" and, specifically, "a peaceful mainland China."

Let me say categorically to this assembly that it is not the policy of the United States to isolate Communist China from the world. On the contrary, we have sought to limit the areas of hostility and to pave the way for the restoration of our historically friendly relations with the great people of China.

Our efforts to this end have taken many forms. Since 1955, United States representatives have held 131 bilateral diplomatic meetings in Geneva, and later in Warsaw, with emissaries from Peking.

We have sought without success to open numerous unofficial channels of communication with mainland China.

We have made it crystal clear that we do not intend to attack, invade or attempt to overthrow the existing regime in Peking.

And we have expressed our hope to see representatives of Peking join us and others in meaningful negotiations on disarmament, a nuclear test ban and a ban on the further spread of nuclear weapons.

But the international community cannot countenance Peking's doctrine and policy of intervening by violence and subversion in other nations, whether under the guise of so-called wars of national liberation against independent countries or under any other guise. Such intervention can find no place in the United Nations Charter, nor in the resolutions of the General Assembly. Yet dozens of nations represented in this hall have had direct experience of these illegal activities.

ISSUE OF RED CHINA

It is in the light of these facts, and of our ardent desire for a better atmosphere, that the United States has carefully considered the issues arising from the absence of representatives of Peking from the United Nations.

Two facts bear on this issue and on the attitude of my country toward any attempted solution.

First, the Republic of China on Taiwan is a founding member of the United Nations and its rights are clear. The United States will vigorously oppose any effort to exclude the representative of the Republic of China from the United Nations in order to put representatives of Communist China in their place.

The second fact is that Communist China, unlike anyone else in the history of this organization, has put forward special and extraordinary terms for consenting to enter the United Nations. In addition to the expulsion of the Republic of China, there are also demands to transform and pervert this organization from its Charter purposes—some of them put forward as recently as yesterday.

What can be the cause of this attitude? We cannot be sure, but we do know that it comes from a leadership whose stated program is to transform the world by violence. It comes from a leadership which openly proclaims it is opposed to any discussion of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

It would almost seem that these leaders wish to isolate their country from a world—and from a United Nations—that they cannot transform and control. Indeed, they have already brought their country to a degree of isolation that is unique in the world today—an isolation not only from the United States and its allies, but from most of the nonaligned world and even from most of the Communist nations. Many, not only the United States, have sought improved relations and have been rebuffed.

At this moment in history, therefore, Mr. President, the basic question about the relation between Communist China and the United Nations is a question to which only the leaders in Peking can give the answer. And I put the question. Will they refrain from putting forward clearly unacceptable terms; and are they prepared to assume the obligations of the United Nations Charter, in particular the basic Charter obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state?

The world—... my Government—will listen most attentively for a helpful response to these questions. We hope it will come soon—the sooner the better. Like many other members here, the United States has the friendliest historic feelings toward the great Chinese people, and looks forward to the occasion when they will once again enrich, rather than endanger, the fabric of the world community, and, in the spirit of the Charter, "practice tolerance, and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

"GREAT AND THORNY ISSUES"

Mr. President, I have dwelt on these great and thorny issues of Asia because they are of far more than regional importance. Progress toward their solution would visibly brighten the atmosphere of international relations all over the world. It would enable the United Nations to turn a new corner—to apply itself with renewed energy to the great tasks of reconciliation and peaceful construction which lies before us in every part of the globe.

Surely peaceful construction is needed above all in the less developed areas. It is needed in Southeast Asia, today a region of conflict but also a region of vast undeveloped resources—where my country is prepared to make a most substantial contribution to the development of the whole region, including North Vietnam. It is needed in the Western Hemisphere, where, under the bold ideals of the Alliance for Progress the states of Latin America are already carrying out a far-reaching, peaceful process of economic and social development.

And indeed, in no area are the tasks of economic development more important than on the continent of Africa—represented in this hall by the delegates of 37 nations. Last

May, in commemorating the anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, the President suggested ways in which the United States, as a friend of Africa, might help with some of that continent's major economic problems. Our efforts in this entire field are now entering a new stage as we begin to carry out the recommendations of a special committee appointed to review United States participation in African development programs, both bilateral and multilateral.

But the economic side of this picture cannot stand alone. The time is past when either peace or material progress could be founded on the domination of one people, or one race or one group, by another. Yet attempts to do this still continue in southern Africa today. As a result, the danger to peace in that area is real.

My Government holds strong views on these problems. We are not, and never will be, content with a minority government in Southern Rhodesia. The objective we support for that country remains as it was stated last May: "to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to all the people of Rhodesia—not just 6 percent of them."

Nor can we ever be content with a situation such as that in South-West Africa, where one race holds another in intolerable subjection under the false name of apartheid.

DECISION IS REGRETTED

The decision of the International Court, in refusing to touch the merits of the question of South-West Africa, was most disappointing. But the application of law to this question does not hang on that decision alone. South Africa's conduct remains subject to obligations reaffirmed by earlier advisory opinions of the Court whose authority is undiminished. Under these opinions, South Africa cannot alter the international status of the territory without the consent of the United Nations; and South Africa remains bound to accept United Nations supervision, submit annual reports to the General Assembly and "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants."

This is no time for South Africa to take refuge in an overly technical finding of the International Court, which did not deal with the substantive merits of the case. The time is overdue—long overdue—for South Africa to accept its obligations to the international community in regard to South-West Africa. Continued violation by South Africa of its plain obligations to the international community would necessarily require all members to take such an attitude into account in their relationships with South Africa.

Mr. President, many other questions of significance will engage our attention during this session of the General Assembly. Foremost among them are questions of disarmament and arms control, of which the most urgent are the completion of a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and the extension of the limited test ban treaty. Remaining differences on these issues can and must be resolved on a basis of mutual compromise.

Finally, I wish to speak of one further matter of great concern both to the United Nations and to my country: the draft treaty to govern activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies.

Major progress has been made in the negotiation of this important treaty, but several issues remain. One of these concerns the question of reporting by space powers on their activities on celestial bodies. A second issue concerns access by space powers to one another's installations on celestial bodies. On both of the points the United States, at the most recent meeting of the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on Outer Space, made significant compromise proposals in the interest of early agreement.

Unfortunately and regretfully, the U.S.S.R. has not responded constructively to these

proposals. Instead, it has insisted on still another matter: a provision requiring states which grant tracking facilities to one country to make the same facilities available to all others—without reciprocity and without regard to the wishes of the granting state. The obligation proposed by the U.S.S.R., as was apparent in the Outer Space Committee, was unacceptable to many countries participating in the outer-space discussions, and was supported only by a very small number of East European states.

Tracking facilities are a matter for bilateral negotiation and agreement. The United States has held such discussions and reached such agreements with a number of countries on a basis of mutual commitment and common advantage. France and the European Space Research Organization have also established widespread tracking networks on a similar basis. It is, of course, open to the U.S.S.R. and any other space power, without objection from my country, to proceed in exactly the same way.

I should like to state today my Government's interest in bilateral cooperation in tracking of space vehicles on the basis of mutual benefits, and I should like to make an offer to help resolve this impasse: If the U.S.S.R. desires to provide for tracking coverage from United States territory, we for our part, are prepared to discuss with Soviet representatives the technical and other requirements involved with a view to reaching some mutually beneficial agreement. Our scientists and technical representatives and meet without delay to explore the possibilities.

The outer space treaty is too important and too urgent to be delayed. This treaty offers us the opportunity to establish, in the unlimited realm of space beyond this planet, a rule of peace and law—before the arms race has been extended into that realm. It is all the more urgent because of man's rapid strides toward landing on the moon.

By far the greater part of the work on the treaty is now behind us. We have agreed on important provisions, including major obligations in the area of arms control. We should proceed to settle the remaining subsidiary issues in a spirit of understanding so that this General Assembly may give its approval to a completed treaty before the Assembly adjourns.

Mr. President, it is our earnest hope that the words of the United States today on all these issues may contribute to concrete steps toward peace and a better world.

We know the difficulties but we are not discouraged. In the 21 turbulent years since the Charter went into effect, we of the United Nations have faced conflicts at least as great and as difficult as any that confront us today. The failure of this organization has been prophesied many times. But all these prophecies have been disproved. Even the most formidable issues have not killed our organization—and none will. Indeed, it has grown great and respected by facing the hardest issues and dealing forthrightly with them.

There is no magic in the United Nations save what we, its members, bring to it. And that magic is a simple thing: our irreducible awareness of our common humanity and our consequent will to peace. Without the awareness and that will, these buildings would be an empty shell. With them, we have here the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the reconciliation of conflicts and the building of the better future for which all mankind yearns.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that we in the Senate have been slow to appreciate the very constructive nature of this splendid address, which was, I understand, cleared by both the Secretary of State and the President before it was delivered. I want

to congratulate both the Secretary of State and the President for having permitted Mr. Goldberg to start this strong peace offensive.

I think that several points in the address are worthy of special comment.

In the first place, Ambassador Goldberg speaks of the necessity for concentrating on the serious dangers to peace now existing in Asia, particularly the war in Vietnam, and indicates that our Government remains determined to exercise every restraint to limit the war and to exert every effort to bring the conflict to the earliest possible end.

My deep regret is that while Mr. Goldberg speaks in the United Nations for the policy of our Government—and supposedly of the President and the Secretary of State—I note in the morning paper that we are sending American troops into the Mekong Delta for the first time. I also noted on a television broadcast this morning that American deaths last week reached a new high since May; that they again exceeded, as they have several weeks in the past, the total South Vietnamese casualties; that the number of wounded is drastically up.

I am gravely concerned that while we talk peace at the United Nations, not only are we accelerating the war in Vietnam, but also, our military commanders are sending American boys unnecessarily to their deaths.

I believe the President should be called upon, in no uncertain terms, to stop this unnecessary slaughter and wounding of American boys, while the peace offensive initiated by Ambassador Goldberg can be given an opportunity to move forward—hopefully to result, at long last, in negotiations.

I point out that Mr. Goldberg, for the first time, makes this fine statement:

We are not engaged in a "holy war" against communism.

This is the first time that any responsible officer of our Government, so far as I know, has made any such statement.

Mr. Goldberg reiterates, and I am happy to hear him reiterate, what has been said before, but which I fear far too many people around the globe do not believe. He says:

We do not seek to establish an American empire or a "sphere of influence" in Asia.

That is good news.

We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances, no permanent American "presence" of any kind in South Vietnam.

That is good news.

We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Vietnam.

That is extraordinarily good news.

We do not seek the overthrow of the government of North Vietnam.

That, too, is encouraging.

We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China or to threaten any of its legitimate interests.

This is, indeed, constructive comment. I would hope that others in the executive branch of the Government have taken careful note of what Mr. Goldberg has said. In particular, I refer to some of the hawks in the Department of State, in

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the Central Intelligence Agency, and in all the other agencies in the executive branch of the Government, who have been taking so belligerent an attitude with respect to our policy in southeast Asia.

Mr. Goldberg says:

We want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict.

Let us stop the search and destroy policy; let us stop the bombing of North Vietnam; let us stop the unnecessary killing of American boys for purposes which do not serve our National interest.

Mr. Goldberg continues:

The United States is willing once again to take the first step. We are prepared to order a cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam—the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered promptly by corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side.

This, indeed, is good news; but while he is saying that, we are stepping up the bombing of North Vietnam; we are moving into the Mekong Delta for the first time; American casualties are at a new high.

Why is it not possible for once, since this unhappy war began, for us to act the way we talk? Why, when we go with this initiative to the United Nations, do we reinstate the bombing of North Vietnam at the same time?

Why can we not coordinate our policy behind the wise statement of Ambassador Goldberg?

Mr. President, in conclusion, although the entire speech deserves careful reading by every Member of the Senate—and I see in the Chamber the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations—I note with great pleasure that Ambassador Goldberg concludes by saying:

Mr. President, many other questions of significance will engage our attention during this session of the General Assembly. Foremost among them are questions of disarmament and arms control, of which the most urgent are the completion of a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and the extension of the limited test ban treaty. Remaining differences on these issues can and must be resolved on a basis of mutual compromise.

Mr. President, I wait for the day when the Secretary of State will permit Ambassador Goldberg, and will permit Mr. William Foster and his associates to make that reasonable compromise which within 24 hours could get us within striking distance of a nonproliferation treaty, by abandoning the outmoded and obsolete concept of a joint nuclear force in which the West German Government would retain an option to get its finger on the nuclear trigger.

I express admiration for Ambassador Goldberg, and I hope that the lead he has taken will be followed by others in the administration.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of North Carolina's ablest young sons, Bill Suttle, president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, made an elo-

23400

reporters and scholars, some of whom have figured prominently in the current purge, to escape to freedom. If Peiping should some day permit their people to visit the United States, it will only mean that the Chinese Communists have decided to send disguised secret agents and agitators to subvert the Americans.

7. Finally, if the medicine prescribed by these "experts" is administered, will the hungry tiger turn into a "humanistic bureaucrat"? We find the "experts" arriving at different conclusions from their shared premises. Some say that a change in Peiping's policy will be possible when Mao Tse-tung dies, citing Peiping's recent frustrations in Indonesia, Cuba, Ghana, and elsewhere. Others tell us that frustrations will only provoke the hungry tiger into more violence. Ironically, the truth of the matter lies in what Marx said of Czarist Russia—aggression is sure to follow aggression and expansion to follow expansion. History and common sense tell us that a hungry tiger's appetite is whetted everytime it gets a good meal.

To sum up, we submit that in their proposals for far-reaching changes in the United States policy, the "experts" have no solid ground to support either their premises or their conclusions. Wittingly or unwittingly, they have helped the Communists, and harmed the cause for free Chinese everywhere in the world. They have rendered a disservice to the United States by undermining American efforts and credibility in the Far East.

We solemnly declare that we have no desire of seeing the United States go to war with the Chinese Communists for, in the event of armed hostilities, both the American people and our own people will suffer. However, should the proposals of the "experts" be adopted, thus fostering the growth of Chamberlainism in the United States, the Chinese Communists may be encouraged to risk a war with the United States as soon as they feel strong enough to do so. It is precisely because we desire to prevent such a war that we feel duty-bound to state our views.

The only things we Chinese people ask of the United States are:

(1) that she, pursuant to the traditional friendship between the two countries, stand firm on her present policy of recognizing the government of the Republic of China as the only legal and true representative of the Chinese people and not the Communist regime in Peiping which does not represent the people on the Chinese mainland; and

(2) that she distinguish friend from foe and refuse to be a party to the Chinese Communists' crime of persecuting the people.

May the United States keep close to her heart the following memorable words of President Abraham Lincoln: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

This open letter signed by more than 1,600 university faculty members and scholars in the Republic of China is brought to you by the following organizations representing Chinese communities in their cities and states:

Chung Ping Tom, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, New York, New York.

Bob Lee, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of New England, Boston, Massachusetts.

Poy Fong, Kai Lee, Co-Presidents, Chinese Benevolent Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Y. N. Yee, President, Chinese Benevolent Association, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

William Chin, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Washington, D.C.

Y. S. Hom, S. M. Chin, Co-Presidents, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Baltimore, Maryland.

Robert Tongman, Chairman of the Board, Chinese Association of Arkansas.

J. W. Lock, President, Lung Kong Tin Yee Association, Memphis, Tennessee.

Wong Yin Doon, King High Tam, Pow Sam Yee, T. Kong Lee, Edward Chen, Tim Hall, James Hsieh, Co-Presidents, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, San Francisco, California.

King C. Yee, Tom Chin, Co-Presidents, On Leong Merchants Association, Detroit, Michigan.

Albert K. Leong, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Frank Wong, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Los Angeles, California.

Gilbert Gor, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Houston, Texas.

M. B. Lew, President, Chinese Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Charles Y. Wah, President, Washington State Chong Wa Benevolent Association, Seattle, Washington.

Sam B. Liu, President, Oregon State Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, Portland, Oregon.

Ray W. Joe, President, On Leong Merchants Association, Greenville, Mississippi.

Frank Gee, President, On Leong Merchants Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

N. K. Wong, President, Chinese Chamber of Commerce, Phoenix, Arizona.

Yuk Hoon Wong, President, United Chinese Labor Association of Hawaii.

STILL TIME TO ACT ON STRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, once again the Nation's industrial peace has been shaken by labor-management stalemates that threaten to erupt into serious strikes.

Only hasty last-minute maneuvering averted a walkout at American Airlines that was scheduled to begin this morning. But, there is every indication that a threatened strike at General Electric will become a reality next Monday. It appears that members of the International Union of Electrical Workers are overwhelmingly rejecting a General Electric contract offer, and the prospects that agreement can be reached before the Monday deadline are dim.

Should General Electric and the IUE somehow arrive at a settlement before Monday, there is still the possibility that Westinghouse, where the IUE's contract expires soon, could be struck.

In addition, compacts in the automobile, trucking, construction, and machinery industries are up for renewal in the near future.

For the moment, we have escaped the hardships and economic losses that accompany major deadlocks. There is little likelihood, however, that we will be able to avoid at least one crippling strike in the next year.

As usual, it will be the public—average citizens with no interest whatever in the issues that divide these particular employers and employees—that will suffer the most from the upcoming walkouts.

Merchants, housewives, students, Americans of every occupation will be hit by the economic fallout from labor-management explosions over which they have no control.

Mr. President, there may be some question as to whether a strike at either General Electric or Westinghouse would have

the impact of this summer's airline strike or last winter's New York subway walk-out. But there can be no questioning the fact that our machinery to deal with such impasses, when they imperil the public interest, is woefully inadequate.

The Railway Labor Act has proven completely ineffectual. It was powerless to protect the American people in 1963, during the railroad work rules dispute. It was powerless to do so last July. It will be just as impotent in the future.

Similarly, the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act offer no final solution to management-union conflicts that pummel the public while they go unresolved.

I am convinced that Congress cannot much longer fail in its obligation to guard the interests of the citizens of this Nation. The precedents for action are clear.

In the airline and other transportation and communication industries, we have already recognized the public stake by providing subsidies and regulating rates and routes. We have in effect declared that these industries perform vital public services and must be operated to benefit the public.

In other types of enterprises, Congress has the responsibility to act under its Constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce.

On February 8 of this year, I introduced S. 2891, a bill to create a five-man U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations. This court would have jurisdiction in labor-management stalemates adversely affecting the national interest and would provide the machinery through which binding settlements could be achieved in the most intransigent deadlocks.

The labor court idea is hardly a new one. Labor columnist Victor Riesel points out that Sweden, which has long had such an institution, has not had a major strike in 21 years. Although the Swedish Court differs in some respects from what I have proposed, its purpose is the same: Labor peace. The results have been spectacularly successful.

In addition, labor courts in Australia and New Zealand have helped cushion those nations against the harsh blows of industrial strife.

Mr. President, the American people should not have to wait for a repetition of this year's 41-day airline strike before Congress moves to tighten our national labor laws.

A first step in that direction should be taken now, before a crisis situation inflames emotions and clouds reason. That first step should be hearings before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, where S. 2891 is now pending.

Although the 89th Congress is nearing adjournment, there is still time to act on this measure, and I am hopeful that we can begin now.

VIETNAM PEACE PROPOSALS OF AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as I read the Vietnam peace proposals offered by Ambassador Goldberg at the United Na-

And they have made a great claim at representing the "reality" of the China debate.

The open letter, to which I have alluded, comes as an effective answer to the utterances of those who would distort, sincerely or otherwise, the issue and history of the China debate.

The letter, which is signed by more than 1,600 university faculty members and scholars in the Republic of China, asserts that "the experts have no solid ground to support either their premises or their conclusions. Wittingly or unwittingly, they have helped the Communists, and harmed the cause for free Chinese everywhere in the world. They have rendered a disservice to the United States by undermining American efforts and credibility in the Far East."

I ask unanimous consent that the "Open Letter to the American People on the 'China Debate'" be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
ON THE "CHINA DEBATE"

In recent months there have been proposals by certain persons in the United States that concessions be made to the Peiping regime in order to induce it to widen its participation in international affairs. Many so-called "China experts" in the United States have figured prominently in an organized propaganda campaign urging for a change of the United States China policy. They have lent their stature in the academic community to the inspired campaign to attain the desired ends. In their efforts to support their contentions they have displayed a knowledge of things Chinese, which is quite superficial even if sincere.

Capitalizing on what they allege as the authoritarian tradition of dynastic China during the last three millenniums, they argue that the Communist regime in Peiping is but the latest manifestation of the mainstream of Chinese cultural heritage. They claim that the existence of the regime is a "reality" which one must face, and that the only way to face up to the "reality" is to work toward a gradual shift from trying to isolate Peiping to admitting it to the United Nations and other international organizations. A few of them have even recommended that the United States policy should aim at eventual establishment of normal diplomatic relations with that regime. Conveniently, they ignore the fact that the regime oppresses the Chinese people and that the Chinese people hate the regime and continue to resist it. Furthermore, the present propaganda campaign is carried out at a time when Americans are dying in southeast Asia to check the expansionism of that very regime which they call Chinese. We, the undersigned, feel obliged to refute the assertions of these "China experts."

These "China experts" have made many assertions at variance with facts, the most apparent of which are as follows:

1. They have distorted Maolism into something representative of a modernized extension of the venerable tradition of China. The true Chinese tradition has, since time immemorial, consisted of love of one's kith and kin; charity for man; the virtues of propriety, humility, loyalty and sympathy, and the pursuit of universal peace and worldwide commonwealth. None of these virtues is compatible with the contrivances of the Chinese Communists to destroy family love and instigate mutual hate and class struggle.

There is really no shortage of Sinologues in the United States. Can any of them find in real Chinese tradition even a shred of Stalinism or such Communist-made manifestations as: brain-washing, liquidation of a father by the son, betrayal of one's friends, slave-labor camps or the "people's communes"?

2. It is alleged that Chinese Communism is an expression of nationalism, a reaction against the humiliations and reverses China had suffered in the 19th century. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who tutored modern China in nationalism, said that Chinese nationalism should aim only at righting past wrongs, and that China, when she achieves power, should not imitate decadent imperialist behavior. Early in this century, Chinese nationalism rose in self-defense against Japanese and Russian expansionism. Quite naturally, China was drawn closer to the West and Dr. Sun clearly advocated economic cooperation between China and the Western nations as the goal of China's national reconstruction. On the other hand, the United States has never encroached upon any Chinese territory and the Chinese have always regarded the United States as a special friend. All the anti-American views one hears now are invented by the Communists and disseminated by their propaganda mills. They do not reflect the true sentiment of the Chinese people on the mainland.

3. The so-called experts strive to extol the supposed Chinese Communist economic and military strength. Of course China is a vast country with an immense population. But the Chinese Communists do not represent the Chinese people. The 600 million Chinese people, to use Peiping's figure, are not an asset but a liability to the Chinese Communists. Furthermore, in talking about economic development under the Chinese Communists, one should always beware of over-stated claims. In 1959, for example, the Chinese Communists themselves openly admitted that all production figures for 1958 had been exaggerated by from 50 to 58 per cent. Yet this is conveniently overlooked by the so-called experts. It is true that the Chinese Communists have test exploded three nuclear devices. These blasts are certainly storm signals. But as Hitler's V-1s and V-2s failed to bring him victory or to frighten the free world into submission, we need not tremble and cower before Mao's mushroom clouds.

4. These experts like to refer to what they call "fact" and "reality." Oh, fact and reality, what foolish acts and evil have been committed in thy name! When Hitler's armies began their march in Europe, Neville Chamberlain and Charles A. Lindbergh argued that this fact and reality must be acknowledged. Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt refused to accept them. When Japan invaded China in 1937, certain American columnists also saw the invasion as an inevitable although unpleasant fact. But we Chinese refused to accept it. The "realists" of today see only what they regard as facts, but decline to take into consideration the actual facts contrary to their thesis, such as: the numerous anti-Communist incidents on the Chinese mainland (249,012 in 1961 versus 56,000 in 1955, according to the Chinese Communist "Ministry of Public Security"), the open rebellion of the intellectuals against the Communists (and in the name of Chinese tradition too), the escape to freedom of thousands upon thousands of youths, and the defection of many officers of Peiping's armed forces and its diplomatic and civil functionaries.

5. The "peace mongers" try to influence the thinking of the peace-loving Americans with the specter of war. Some say a new policy of accommodation and gradual yielding is the only alternative. Since war is dangerous, recognition of the Peiping regime becomes a panacea. But what inherent right

have the Chinese Communists to present the United States with the choice between submission and war? Has not the United States the same right to insist that the Chinese Communists give up the use of force and their announced goal of world revolution through subversion and "people's liberation wars"? Some say Peiping is a "hungry tiger" which loses its temper when frustrated or irritated by the United States. If this "pet" is lovingly patted and well fed, so the theory goes, it will regain its Confucian virtues. Such views of the "China-experts" dumbfound us. They are defending the tiger's right to devour others in the hope that it will never be hungry again.

6. These experts prescribe "containment without isolation" under which five steps are urged:

General softening of the United States policy toward Peiping to achieve "containment without isolation". This, however, is self-contradiction. Unless the regime is effectively isolated it will continue to resort to subversive activities as it has been doing all along. Containment then becomes impossible. In that event, not only the free world position in Southeast Asia will become untenable, but the retreat will not be confined to Vietnam. Furthermore, these same experts say that this formula of "containment without isolation" has proved effective in dealing with Soviet Russia, but they forget that whatever compromise Moscow has made should be attributed only to United States firmness, not concessions.

Admission of Peiping into the United Nations. For a variety of reasons some American experts advocate a seat in the United Nations for the Chinese Communists, "even though they said they would dynamite the place." Peiping's admission would violate both the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. Furthermore the Chinese Communists will certainly engage in large-scale subversive activities in the United States. These experts, at the same time, suggest half-heartedly that the United Nations seat of the Republic of China should be preserved. In reality, however, they are dealing a severe blow to the cause of a free China, and denying the people on the Chinese mainland any hope of deliverance.

Lifting of the trade embargo on the Chinese Communists, and acceptance of their participation in nuclear controls. If isolation of the Chinese Communists is to end, the embargo on trade with the Chinese mainland would have to be lifted, these experts contend. This is tantamount to helping the enemy by replenishing his stocks and arsenals. The Chinese Communists are already employing to great advantage their crude bombs for blackmail. They have arrogantly refused to join the nuclear test ban treaty. Why should they accept international controls unless, as they have proposed, the United States would scrap all nuclear weapons along with them? And even then, who can guarantee that they will not continue to develop their atomic arsenal in secret, and will not in time brandish their bombs to threaten the world?

Progression from appeasing flexibility to eventual recognition. These American experts are in fact asking the United States to yield to their pressure and accord diplomatic recognition to a U.N.-condemned aggressor, who is directly and vicariously responsible for the murder of Americans in Korea and Vietnam. Such a proposal makes a mockery of righteousness and justice, and constitutes a breach of faith with thousands upon thousands of Americans who gave their lives unhesitatingly for freedom.

Permitting Chinese Communist reporters and scholars to visit the United States. As expected, Peiping has already rejected contemptuously recent American offers to exchange visits, for it has no intention of lifting up the Bamboo Curtain to allow its own

tions last week, it seems to me that the tone of compromise is greater than it has ever been before.

To my knowledge, for example, we have never stated with such clarity that we do not ask North Vietnam to surrender anything "which belongs to it," nor do we seek to exclude "any segment" of South Vietnam from participating in peace discussions or in the peaceful future of their country.

Ambassador Goldberg also restated, with eloquence and firmness, the limited purposes for which the United States is giving assistance to South Vietnam, and exactly what our aims there are.

Because I feel we cannot repeat too often our aims in southeast Asia and our moderate and judicious proposals for ending the Vietnam conflict, I should like to read them again here, as expressed by Ambassador Goldberg:

First, this is what we are not doing in Vietnam.

We are not engaged in a "holy war" against communism.

We do not seek to establish an American empire or a "sphere of influence" in Asia.

We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances, no permanent American "presence" of any kind in South Viet Nam.

We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Viet Nam.

We do not seek the overthrow of the Government of North Viet Nam.

We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China nor to threaten any of its legitimate interests.

We do not ask of North Viet Nam an unconditional surrender or indeed the surrender of anything that belongs to it; nor do we seek to exclude any segment of the South Vietnamese people from peaceful participation in their country's future.

And, now this is briefly what we seek:

We want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict. By the same token, we reject the idea that North Viet Nam has a right to impose a military solution.

We seek to assure for the people of South Viet Nam the same right of self-determination—to decide their own political destiny, free of force—that the United Nations Charter affirms for all.

And we believe that reunification of Viet Nam should be decided through a free choice by the peoples of both the North and South without outside interference, the results of which choice we are fully prepared to support.

It seems to me this puts the problem pretty directly in the lap of the government at Hanoi. The next move is up to them. We reiterate our good faith offer to negotiate unconditionally for a political settlement without loss of honor by those involved.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the concept of ombudsman has started to interest many people across the Nation. An article appeared in *Focus/Midwest*, 1965, suggesting that—

As the Ombudsman program is more readily transferable to state rather than to the Federal Government in our country, Missouri and Illinois could take the lead in bringing this concept to the U.S.A.

Mr. President, I think it is important for the States to consider the merits of

an ombudsman system. I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the Record, the article referred to.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE NEED AN OMBUDSMAN (Thomas E. Eichhorst)

What can you do if a bureaucrat irritates you, or delays too long, or requires too much red tape, or petulantly denies what you want?

This problem is of increasing importance as governmental agencies proliferate and their activities become even more encompassing. The answer, like many other reforms, is the result of the political experimentation in that great practical laboratory of social progress—Scandinavian government; it is the Ombudsman.

Nordic peoples have long provided a review for the actions of the leadership of the tribe or nation. The fierce and rapacious Vikings have left a deep and lasting impression on our concepts of fair play and justice that more than compensates for their violent visitations a millenium ago. These warriors established *lovsigemands* (law speakers) who would proclaim the law and regulate the primitive processes of government. The first truly representative national assembly is another of the governmental gifts of the Norseman; the Iceland Althing, established in 930, is the world's oldest parliamentary body.

The office of Ombudsman inaugurated in 1809, is but another part of Sweden's development of a bureaucracy bound by the rule of law. The Swedish Parliament must choose a person of known legal ability and of outstanding integrity for Ombudsman. Though a lawyer, he is not bound by legalistic rules, but instead is encouraged to be an ingenious pragmatist in order to find an acceptable remedy for every administrative error. The powers and jurisdiction of that Swedish Ombudsman have been continually extended so that his area of review now includes almost all of the national bureaucracy.

The other Scandinavian nations have also established such an office: Finland in 1919, Denmark in 1955, and Norway in 1962.

In recent years the value of this Office has become more widely known and the practice has now jumped half-a-world to New Zealand, where an Ombudsman was recently appointed. At present, England, Australia, and several of the western provinces of Canada are considering setting up a similar program. As the Ombudsman program is more readily transferable to state rather than to the federal government in our country, Missouri and Illinois could take the leading in bringing this concept to the U.S.A.

The Ombudsman, which in Swedish means agent, is an official appointed, usually by the legislature, to see that the people are treated properly by their government. The Ombudsman is not unlike the man who hears complaints in a large department store. He is the man who hears every grievance, no matter how fanciful or far-fetched. Indeed, he concerns himself with the pettifogging complaints no one else in the impersonal government seems to bother about.

Under the present Ombudsman systems, his activity is usually triggered by a letter of complaint from a citizen. The Ombudsman then investigates the action (or inaction) in an attempt to obtain satisfaction for the citizens. Sometimes, as a result of investigating such a complaint, or on his own motion, he may decide to make a major study of a large problem involving many individual cases. The Ombudsman inquires into substance, procedure, legality, delay, convenience, and even politeness. While he has no power to change administrative deci-

sions, he can investigate, criticize, recommend, and publicize.

The theory and practice of Ombudsman-ship is grounded on the cardinal principle of checks and balances. This principle, as it relates to the Ombudsman system, prescribes that the action of a government official should be reviewed by another official who can challenge the action, but cannot substitute judgment. Because the Ombudsman is not involved in making the substantive decisions, he can focus his attention on the administrative procedures. The essential idea behind this system is the view that continuing constructive criticism can significantly improve the governmental processes.

The success of the program depends on the personality of the man chosen for the office. To properly perform his duties, the Ombudsman should combine an intimate knowledge of state government and the leading political and administrative personalities with a profound belief in freedom and democracy; be shrewd, tolerant, good humored, and be imbued with a sense of the value and the limits of his office, and be without vanity or self-importance. Every country which has established the office, has been blessed with an able and very human administrator with a penchant for anonymity—just what the position requires.

If, as a result of his investigations, the Ombudsman finds that the bureaucrat's actions were wrong, he can publicly or privately reprimand him. This power has been helpful in restoring a sense of purpose to an errant government worker, particularly when the complaint has involved an impersonal or condescending attitude held by some administrative employees. In other cases, the Ombudsman might refuse to criticize a past decision of a government worker, but probably would suggest guidelines for future actions. When the basic procedures are faulty, he can recommend far reaching changes and improvements. It is up to the administrative officials or the legislature to implement these suggestions. It has been the experience of the Scandinavian countries having the Ombudsman, that the prestige of the office and the publicity given to his pronouncements by the popular press are powerful weapons. The threat of possible criticism by the Ombudsman has had a desirable effect upon public officials and civil servants.

The rectification of individual wrongs, and the continuing improvement of the administrative system are the readily recognizable results of the Ombudsman's efforts. Even more important, however, is the spark of creativity which it gives to and requires of the entire corps of government workers. This on-going interest in the monotonous minutiae assists each worker to see every dull dreary task as a challenge and, no less real, as a possible cause for a complaint to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman's criticisms apply to all areas of administrative activity: his imaginative study of these problems and his creative suggestions are the prods needed to perfect the controls policing governmental work. This broad arsenal of remonstrative devices has been extremely helpful in preserving human values in governmental bureaucracies.

This Scandinavian concept of reformative internal action and initiative could well provide us with a practical model which we could adapt to help solve our own administrative problems. Having an agent for the citizenry, inside the bureaucracy itself, would have a salutary effect on all state workers—the merit system employee as well as the patronage jobholder. Such a vibrant catalyst in, say, Jefferson City, Missouri and Springfield, Illinois could be recommended by the newly inaugurated governors who would thus initiate a novel service for their citizens.

DEDICATION OF BIG BEND RESERVOIR IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on September 15, well-attended and highly appropriate ceremonies were held in South Dakota to dedicate the completion of the Big Bend Reservoir, one of the great Missouri River reservoirs which now comprise what we call "The Great Lakes of South Dakota." These lakes are second only in size in this country to the natural Great Lakes stretching from Chicago to Buffalo.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered a highly effective address at the dedication, reviewing the foreign policy pattern of the United States and all pertinent factors relating to our part in the war in Vietnam. His address was warmly received by the more than 4,000 South Dakotans attending the dedication ceremonies.

One of the highlights of the speaking program was an address by an enrolled member of the Sioux Indian Tribe, Mr. Philip S. Byrnes, now holding an off-reservation job in our State Capital Pierre. Mr. Byrnes held the audience spellbound as he delivered a thrilling and most impressive address reviewing early history and how the great Sioux nation had once lived their lives, fought their wars, shot their buffalo, and made their homes in the attractive Missouri River Valley. Many of them were, in fact, displaced and moved elsewhere as the result of the impounded waters of Big Bend Reservoir.

Mr. President, for the information of Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of the fine address by Mr. Byrnes.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PHILIP S. BYRNES

Mr. Secretary, honored guests, fellow citizens of America. It is my privilege and honor to represent the Sioux Nation at this historic occasion.

What's better than a scene of togetherness in our great country today, as we meet here to officially dedicate the completion of the Big Bend Dam.

Four of these large dams cover valuable home land areas of the Sioux country across the State of South Dakota.

In behalf of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Sioux, I wish to state that we are proud to have made our contribution in the construction of these important projects that were started by men of vision, for the strength and progress of our country. From where we stand and as we look across this beautiful lake you can see the banks of the Crow Creek Reservation, and the location where we are now, is the Lower Brule Reservation. The Missouri River is the dividing line of these two important Sioux reservations.

In order to understand the existence of the Sioux Indians and the great plains area which constitute their home, an awareness of history must be maintained.

This great river flowed through the heart of the Sioux home for many centuries. The Sioux lived along this river and within its watersheds. From this river, the Sioux Indians received their strength.

On the great plains from which flows the waters that feed the Missouri River there

were large herds of buffalo, the life-blood of our forefathers. Within this area the Sioux developed a self-supporting way of life and were in control of the area, and for many centuries enjoyed the abundant life, but progress was not to be denied.

Foreseeable changes were inevitable in this world if progress was to be made. The Sioux defended its way of life as honorably and as bravely as their resources would allow, but their strength was not enough to stop the encroachment of civilization on its march to the West.

With the passing of the buffalo, our strength and way of life was forever changed. The Sioux found it necessary to make treaties and become part of the Nation of America. We cherish this civilization and, as in the past, will in the future defend with all our strength this country against nations who try to defeat our country and rob us of our freedom and way of life.

It has not been easy for many of the Sioux to change sufficiently to cope with the standards of living which modern civilization demands. However, many have become outstanding personalities in various professions and leaders in the destiny of this Nation.

The values which were lost by the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Sioux for the flood water of the Big Bend Dam were the rich level flat lands along the Missouri River, the choice and highest priced of all lands in this area. This water front carried also great values to our people in the form of valuable timber. It furnished cover for wild animal life and wild fruit and vegetables were plentiful. From these things our people have been accustomed for generations to get fuel, food and shelter.

The spirit of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Sioux is for progress.

The money received for the payment of their losses is being used to develop a cattle economy as a substitute for the native economy that vanished with the buffalo. Small industry has been installed, and with the development of their natural resources, the building of better homes on both reservations.

The most important program is scholarship grants for higher education for the young people. Some of our Indian students have already graduated from college with degrees and are holding responsible jobs in this highly competitive country in which we live. By evaluating the historical background of the Sioux Indians who once roamed and hunted on the Great Plains, enjoying nature's bounty and their own undisputed might, it becomes evident that the Sioux Nation went through a great change and it is a most fitting tribute to them that by treaty agreements we have become one great nation.

Mr. Secretary, it is our hope as you and leaders of our country gather around the council tables of the world, that our message at this time will in some measure be an inspiration to you and will give you a feeling of support from the Sioux people of the Great Plains area.

In behalf of the Sioux Indians, our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let our conceptions be enlarged to the circle of our duties. Let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act. Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country. And, by the blessing of God, may our country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration.

OUR ASIAN ALLIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the lively interests which Asian nations are showing in taking the initiative for peace and for backing up South Vietnam's fight for independence and sovereignty, and their escalating interest in siding with the United States and South Vietnam, is encouraging.

Also encouraging is the forthcoming Manila conference. Although it is met with varying degrees of hope, it is indisputably hopeful. Two editorials from yesterday's Washington newspapers, reflect this hope.

That we have Asian allies increasingly willing to step forward and be counted, and to work toward a solution of the problems in the Pacific, is made clearer, too, by the words of Thailand's Foreign Minister, Mr. Thanat Khoman, to the United Nations on Tuesday.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials, one published in the Washington Post and the other in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, and a report from the New York Times on the speech of Thanat Khoman be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 28, 1966]

MANILA CONFERENCE

The seven-nation conference at Manila, which President Johnson has promptly agreed to attend, is welcome for any contributions that the group can make to peace and stability in South Vietnam. It is welcome, besides, as a product of Asian initiative. And it is to be hoped that it may mark the beginning of a post-war era in which the United States will play a different role than the one which has been imposed upon it during a period of readjustment in Asia.

It is not possible for the United States, as the major power touching on the Pacific, let alone the most powerful country in the world, to avoid entanglement in the problems of the region. It is, by reason of geography, national interest and World War II obligations, a Pacific power. It should not think of itself nor be thought of by other Asian countries as "the" Pacific power. The rising strength and stability of Asian allies can diminish the disproportionate contributions of the United States to the forces making for peace and stability in the region. The Manila meeting is a good sign that Asian friends are ready to rise to a role appropriate to their power and resources in the region. The American contribution, for the foreseeable future, will have to be great. But it ought to be a diminishing one.

President Marcos has given a great impetus to the political impulses of our Pacific friends throughout the region. It is evident that he found Washington receptive to his notions on his recent visit here. No doubt it would be naive to suppose and overly sanguine to expect that Manila will usher in at once a revolutionary transfer of power and responsibility to the collective Pacific countries. This transition can proceed only in conformity with the realities of power in the region. But it is not too much to hope that in this decade we may see the foundations laid for a redistribution of responsibility under which the United States ultimately will not need to act anywhere in the region, except in concert with, in support of,

and—for the most part—on the initiative of Asian powers.

That ought to be the long-run objective of American policy—and of the policy of all our Asian allies. May Manila mark a step toward that desirable end.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 28, 1966]

MEETING IN MANILA

On the face of things, it is difficult to see how the meeting which has been scheduled for next month in Manila can make much of a contribution toward settling the war in Viet Nam. The same thing is true of the announcement that Pope Paul VI is sending a special mission from the Vatican to Saigon. And for that matter much the same may be said of the peace initiatives which have come from Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations and from Secretary General U Thant.

Wars are not ended by assembling dignitaries in Manila or in any other place. The first and overriding requirement is a genuine desire to arrive at a settlement. This applies of course to Washington. And it also applies, with particular emphasis in this case, to Saigon, Hanoi, Peking and Moscow. To say the least, the reactions from the last three capitals have not been encouraging.

Nevertheless, since surface appearances can be misleading, it is right, we think, that President Johnson should go to Manila. The inspiration for that meeting apparently came from President Marcos of the Philippines. Other nations which will be represented are South Viet Nam, South Korea, Thailand, Australia and New Zealand. They have a direct and compelling interest in finding a peaceful solution for the troubles in Southeast Asia, for they will be directly under the guns if, for lack of a peaceful settlement, a general war should erupt in the area. Nor can Hanoi and Peking really be entirely indifferent to this prospect, despite their seeming indifference now. For President Marcos was unquestionably right when he said to the United Nations that Asian people are under an "inescapable obligation to devise Asian solutions to Asian problems." This principle, he added, "is at once so just and so indisputably right that Hanoi and Peking will be under a strong moral obligation to relax their hostile attitude."

Wishful thinking? Perhaps so. But having in mind all the straws that have been flying in the wind, especially the lively interest that the Vatican is displaying in the search for a peaceful settlement, it is difficult to believe that the other side is as determined to pursue what for them is now a losing war as the words coming out of Hanoi would indicate. Today's new Viet Cong statement of the conditions which might lead to peace talks is a further hopeful development.

Disappointment may await this hope. If so, there will be no choice for us except to stay in the fight. In this connection, it was right for Defense Secretary McNamara to announce plans for the acquisition of 280 new combat aircraft in the next fiscal year and for the White House to make it known that the next budget will provide added billions for the coming months of conflict. Hanoi should be put on plain notice that an adamant refusal to discuss peace will mean more, not less, punishment in the future.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1966]

THAI, IN U.N., BACKS THE UNITED STATES AND CRITICIZES THANT'S POSITION—THANAT SAYS COMMUNISTS ARE AGGRESSORS IN VIETNAM AND OPPOSES APPEASEMENT

(By Drew Middleton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 27.—Thanat Khoman, Thailand's Foreign Minister declared today that the United Nations and its officials did not have the right to

barter South Vietnam's freedom and sovereignty for dubious promises of peace.

That passage and others in Mr. Thanat's address to the General Assembly were widely interpreted as attacking Secretary General Thant's three-step program for peace. The Foreign Minister asserted that events had shown that neither the United Nations nor Mr. Thant could do much, if anything, to achieve a peaceful solution in Southeast Asia.

Nor did the Thai leader join the almost universal chorus demanding that Mr. Thant remain in office, a chorus in which both the United States and the Soviet Union have joined. The Secretary General, he noted had been forced to adopt "a totally despondent posture" as a result of the failure of his peace efforts.

DEMANDS CONCESSIONS

Mr. Thanat's was an Asian voice that forcefully rejected any peace proposals that rewarded what he termed aggression and failed to extract concessions from North Vietnam and Communist doctrines "born in the dark and sordid recesses of European ghettos."

The speech marked, in the words of one distinguished West European delegate, the first time in this session that a pro-Western Asian "has spoken clearly against any attempt at appeasement" of the Communists.

Mr. Thanat's comments troubled many delegates from the smaller powers. His frank intransigence worried those who believed that something was stirring among the Asian Communist powers and that the smallest changes in the United States position would lead to the start of peace negotiations.

Mr. Thanat's denunciation of any appeasement of the Communists shocked what has been called by Western diplomats the "peace at any price" group among the delegations and senior members of the United Nations Secretariat.

That group has accepted the Secretary General's three-step program and his own authority as the keys to peace. It also strongly favors Communist China's entry into the United Nations as one means toward peace in Asia.

CHALLENGE TO PEKING

Paul Hasluck, Australia's Minister for External Affairs, took an aggressive line on that question in his speech to the General Assembly. He challenged Peking to give at least a sign that it would obey the Charter of the United Nations if entry were granted.

"China asks the United Nations to change," he said. "Is China not to make any change itself to fit into the United Nations?"

Recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations will not solve the larger problems of relations with that country, Mr. Hasluck warned. He told advocates of admission not to oversimplify the China issue by "seeing it simply in terms of recognition or of admission to the United Nations."

Mr. Thanat was highly critical of Mr. Thant's three steps for a settlement in Vietnam. The first calls for cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam.

Everyone seems to have forgotten, the Thai Minister said, that bombing has been halted twice in the past without worthwhile results. On the contrary, he declared, it gave the Communists the opportunity to gather strength for an intensification of the war.

SEES ONE-SIDED APPROACH

Perhaps alluding to President de Gaulle, Mr. Thanat said that others had advocated the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam without mentioning North Vietnamese forces. The French President proposed American withdrawal in a speech at Phnompenh, Cambodia, early this month.

"As any impartial observer may notice," Mr. Thanat said, "many if not all the solu-

tions so far advanced by one party or another tend to favor the side which instigated the war for the purpose of placing South Vietnam under its control."

Apparently with Cambodia in mind, Mr. Thanat warned that short-sighted views on the term for peace might pave the way for the destruction of those who hold them. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Cambodian chief of state, has generally supported President de Gaulle's position on the war.

Mr. Thanat conceded that the proposal for an Asian peace conference, backed by his own country, the Philippines and Malaysia, had failed to evoke a positive response from North Vietnam or Communist China.

That, he said, shows that one side favors a peaceful settlement, while "the other has so far rejected every move towards a peaceful settlement."

It is the aggressors, the Thai leader declared, who cling to the idea of a military solution in Vietnam while the United States and its allies seek a negotiated peace. It is the Communists, he said, who proclaim that the war is "a holy war of national liberation."

GOOD NEWS ABOUT PROJECT HEADSTART

-Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Project Headstart, the Federal preschool program for needy children, has gotten off to a running start.

We have long known that the children of the poor need help in many ways. All over the country concerned people have eagerly awaited an analysis of the first results of Headstart to see if the program can help young children acquire the basis they need for the years of education to follow.

Now, it Hartford, Conn., the first series of tests has been completed. Many aspects of the tests scores are encouraging—some are even spectacular—and all are of interest in planning for our young people's education in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Headstart Youngsters Show Remarkable IQ Improvement," which appeared in the Hartford Courant on September 14, 1966, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADSTART YOUNGSTERS SHOW REMARKABLE IQ IMPROVEMENT (By John Lacy)

The first test results in Hartford's preschool child development program reveal "a remarkable increase" in the performance of many children.

A year ago, seven of the four-year-olds tested had intelligence quotient (IQ) scores above 110 and the highest was 118. After nine months in the program, 21 children scored over 110 and five of them were above 130.

Also, many language difficulties were erased.

"I'm really delighted," said Mrs. Jeraldine Withycombe, director of the federally sponsored "Head Start" program designed to help children in the city's poverty areas. "It's beyond what we thought we could do."

"We're encouraged," said Dr. John Cawley, head of the University of Connecticut Department of Special Education, who directed the testing and who reported the preliminary results to Mrs. Withycombe.

"COME THROUGH"

"This does not mean," Cawley said, "that the children 'got smarter,' but it is more likely that the pre-school program provided them with the experimental background and sophistication which enabled them to 'come through.'"

He found improvement also in children's ability with language.

"It seems we have intervened with a regression tendency—that is, a tendency for the children to fall further behind—while, at the same time, the language deficit of many children has been overcome," Cawley said.

After nine months in the program, three times as many pre-schoolers showed a level of intellectual ability that could lead them to education beyond high school.

Last September 30 of those tested had IQ scores below 75. But in May only 10 fell below the mark.

"In spite of the fact that many children showed a remarkable increase in their performance," Cawley said, "there are some who did not derive as much benefit."

Three kinds of tests were used with 140 to 150 children from five pre-school centers in all corners of the city. The tests measured general intellectual ability, language development and motor perception and motor behavior as well as social awareness.

RESULTS INCOMPLETE

The results are incomplete, Cawley said, but he added: "I'm sure that we've gotten real good stuff."

He said he knows of nowhere else in the country that children received such "a massive battery of tests."

"There are some tremendous individual differences," he said.

For example, he said, one child whose performance last September was "average" would be called "gifted" today.

"In some instances, the scores of kids almost doubled," and still these children were below normal, said Cawley. "This gives you some idea of the deficit they have."

On a task-performance test, some of the pre-schoolers scored "well above the seven-year level," he said. "That's quite a behavior level for these kids."

The child development program financed mostly by federal funds through the Community Renewal Team, schooled 700 children last year under the direction of Mrs. Withycombe and the Hartford Board of Education.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL CITES NEED FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a bill which would undermine a recent Defense Department decision to seek competitive bids for its overseas shipping is pending before the Senate. As I have said before, if this bill is called up for a vote, I intend to debate it thoroughly and in extreme detail because of the mischief it would do to sound, economic shipping policy.

The Milwaukee Journal recognizes this proposal for what it is, "blatant special interest legislation with the very purpose to discriminate against lake ports."

The Journal is absolutely right. Since the St. Lawrence Seaway opened, the Great Lakes ports have had to face the power of coastal shipping conferences in attempting to get a rightful share of Government shipping. This discrimination has cost the Government and taxpayer millions of dollars because negotiated freight charges are designed to keep even the most inefficient ship companies solvent at the expense of more progressive

and economical Great Lakes shipping facilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the September 27 issue of the Milwaukee Journal be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE PORTS PENALIZED

The port of Milwaukee has had to struggle ever since the seaway opened to procure the share of government shipments that would most economically and efficiently move abroad through lake ports instead of coastal ones.

One hope of progress lies in the recent decision of the defense department to avoid its overseas shipments by competitive bidding, instead of negotiating rates with conferences of American flag lines as in the past. These conferences are dominated by coastal shippers who have pretty well seen to it that the lakes don't get the business.

The department is strongly supported in this new policy by congress' joint economic subcommittee on procurement, with a sizable cut in the department's annual \$400 million shipping bill as reason enough. But now Sen. PROXMIRE (D-Wis.) sounds the alert against a sly move to rule out this use of competitive bidding by law.

A bill has been quickly introduced and quickly maneuvered onto the senate floor for action, he reports, that would direct the department to resume and perpetuate the old conference negotiation method of placing its shipments. This can make no pretense of being anything except blatant special interest legislation, with the very purpose to discriminate against lake ports.

PROXMIRE has warned the majority leader that if the bill should be called up for passage it would "require extensive and exhaustive debate" to make sure of killing it—translate filibuster—and that he will have some cohorts if needed. Not only lake ports but all taxpayers should hope he succeeds.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA CASE MOVES ANOTHER STEP

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on September 12, Commissioner Saul Rich and Gamer, of the Court of Claims, filed a report on the proceedings before him as to the amount of recovery to which the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska are entitled for lands taken from them in southeast Alaska by the United States.

The record for these proceedings is more than 50,000 pages long. The briefs of counsel covered more than a thousand pages. Mr. Gamer's findings, numbering 327, cover 192 pages.

Commissioner Gamer has had a difficult task. It was his job to determine the value of virtually all of southeastern Alaska, including timber, minerals, fisheries and other resources, to which the Tlingit and Haida Indians have claimed aboriginal or original Indian title. Although the original Court of Claims decision, that the Tlingit and Haida Indians are entitled to recovery, was handed down in October of 1959, it is understandable it has taken until now to make the evaluation which was reserved for further proceedings when the initial decision was made.

But this is not the end of this case. Commissioner Gamer's report is only a series of factual findings. There will now be exceptions and answers filed by counsel on both sides. This will be fol-

lowed by the filing of legal briefs. Finally, there will be oral argument by the Government and Indian attorneys before the five-member Court of Claims sitting en banc.

It will not surprise anyone familiar with Court of Claims procedure if another year goes by before a final decision is reached by the court.

Commissioner Gamer made several findings of particular interest to those who have been following this case. The first of these is finding No. 316 which is a summary of the fair market value for the lands claimed by the Tlingits and Haidas and damages for the minerals, fisheries, and timber removed from the lands and waters prior to the taking:

In summary, the fair market value of plaintiffs' lands and waters, and their resources, taken by defendant, comprising all the areas the parties have designated as areas 1-6, was, as of the several taking dates, \$14,034,953.80. Damages for the value of the minerals, timber and fisheries taken from plaintiffs' lands and waters prior to such several taking dates of areas 1-5, and which would represent compensation to plaintiffs for the exploitation of such lands and waters during such pretaking periods, totaled \$1,547,205. As to area 6, such damages resulting from such exploitation prior to June 19, 1935, of unpatented lands (or lands prior to their having been patented), and from the exploitation of the fisheries of the area, totaled \$352,210.

The total of such amounts is \$15,934,368.80.

The second is finding 327 which is a summary of the value to the Indians reads as follows:

In summary, on the basis of the evidence, the exploitable value to plaintiffs of their lands, waters, and resources, i.e., the amount the Tlingit and Haida Indians could reasonably have realized had they continued to exercise full and complete possession and control of those lands and waters of southwest Alaska which were taken from them as delineated in the previous proceedings, was \$1,287,200, as follows:

Placer gold fields.....	\$100,000
Salmon fisheries.....	1,000,000
Halibut and herring fisheries.....	187,200
Total	1,287,200

The claimants, the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, argue that they should be compensated in the amount of the fair market value of the land at the time of the taking.

The Government on the other hand argues that the Tlingits and Haidas should be compensated only on the "value to the Indians" basis. This is commonly known as the value of nuts and berries.

It will be up to the court to determine which basis applies to the Tlingit and Haida case.

Mr. President we all look forward to the conclusion of this case. It has been more than 30 years since the Congress enacted the first Tlingit and Haida Jurisdictional Act. All Alaskans, especially the Tlingits and Haidas will welcome the final decision of the court.

THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY'S CODE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, recently a number of my colleagues in both the Senate and the House submitted for